

ORIENTATIONS OF MORSE FLOW TREES IN LEGENDRIAN CONTACT HOMOLOGY

CECILIA KARLSSON

ABSTRACT. Let Λ be a spin Legendrian submanifold of the 1-jet space of a smooth manifold. We prove that the Legendrian contact homology of Λ with integer coefficients can be computed using Morse flow trees. We also give an algorithm for explicitly computing the sign of a rigid flow tree.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Morse flow trees	5
3. Algorithm for calculating the sign of a flow tree	14
4. An example	32
5. Orientation of pseudo-holomorphic disks	36
6. Capping orientation of flow trees	57
7. Stabilization of capping sequences	71
8. Stabilized capping orientation in the limit	87
9. Stabilization - analytical details	108
Appendix A. Families of Fredholm operators related to trees	118
References	122

1. INTRODUCTION

Let M be a smooth manifold of dimension n and let $J^1(M) = T^*M \times \mathbb{R}$ denote its 1-jet space, with local coordinates $(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n, z)$. This space can be given the structure of a contact manifold, with contact distribution $\xi = \text{Ker}(dz - \sum_i y_i dx_i)$.

A submanifold $\Lambda \subset J^1(M)$ is called *Legendrian* if it is n -dimensional and everywhere tangent to ξ . A *Reeb chord* of Λ is a flow segment of the *Reeb vector field* ∂_z , having its start and end point on Λ . Associated to the 1-jet space of M there are three projections, the *base projection* $\Pi: J^1(M) \rightarrow M$, the *front projection* $\Pi_F: J^1(M) \rightarrow J^0(M) = M \times \mathbb{R}$ and the *Lagrangian projection* $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}: J^1(M) \rightarrow T^*M$. Legendrian submanifolds of $J^1(M)$ project to Lagrangian submanifolds of the symplectic manifold $(T^*M, dx \wedge dy)$ under the Lagrangian projection, and Reeb chords project to double points of these Lagrangians.

A *Legendrian isotopy* is a continuous 1-parameter family of Legendrian submanifolds. The *Legendrian contact homology* of Λ is a Legendrian isotopy invariant which was introduced by Eliashberg, Givental and Hofer in [EGH00], and independently by Chekanov in [Che02] for the case $M = \mathbb{R}$. The analytical details underlying the theory were worked out by Ekholm, Etnyre and Sullivan in [EES05a, EES05b, EES07]. Briefly, Legendrian contact homology is the homology of a differential graded algebra (DGA), generated by the Reeb chords of Λ and where the differential counts pseudo-holomorphic disks in T^*M having boundary on $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$. When $\dim(M) = 1$ the Riemann mapping theorem reduces the problem of counting the disks to combinatorics, but in higher dimensions one has to solve non-linear PDEs to find the disks. To simplify an analogous problem in Lagrangian Floer homology, Fukaya and Oh in [FO97] introduced *gradient flow trees*, which are trees with edges along gradient flow lines in M , and gave a one-to-one correspondence between rigid gradient flow trees and rigid pseudo-holomorphic disks in T^*M with boundary on the Lagrangians. In [Ekh07], Ekholm generalized this method to also work in the Legendrian contact homology setting.

In the present paper we will combine the results in [Ekh07] with the results in [EES05b], where it is proved that Legendrian contact homology can be defined using $\mathbb{Z}$ -coefficients. This corresponds to orienting moduli spaces of holomorphic disks in a coherent way and builds on the work of Fukaya, Oh, Ohta and Ono in [FOOO09], where they describe a way to orient the determinant line of the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator over the space of trivialized Lagrangian boundary conditions for the unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$.

The main result of this paper is a combinatorial algorithm for computing Legendrian contact homology with $\mathbb{Z}$ -coefficients, using orientations of stable and unstable manifolds belonging to the Morse flow trees of Λ . That is, we give a computable, coherent orientation scheme for moduli spaces of rigid Morse flow trees. The given algorithm is a generalization and an extension of the orientation scheme described in [EENS13] in the case $n = 2$.

1.1. Outline. Let $\Lambda \subset J^1(M)$ be a spin Legendrian submanifold. We will assume that Λ is *front generic*, meaning that $\Pi: \Lambda \rightarrow M$ is an immersion outside a co-dimension 1 submanifold $\Sigma \subset \Lambda$. The points in Σ we call *cusp points*. We will also assume that Λ

has *simple front singularities*, meaning that the points in Σ are projected to standard cusp singularities under the front projection. See [Ekh07].

Locally, away from Σ , the Legendrian Λ can be described as the multi-1-jet graph of locally defined functions $f_1, \dots, f_l : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Fix a metric g on M . The Morse flow trees of Λ are defined using negative gradient flows of such function differences. I.e. the edges of the flow trees will be solution curves of $-\nabla(f_i - f_j)$ in M , and these curves are patched together at 2- and 3-valent vertices, where the local defining functions change. The tree is a directed graph with one root, and the direction of the edges are given by the flow direction of the defining vector fields. For example, at a 3-valent vertex we can have an incoming flow line which solves $-\nabla(f_1 - f_3)$, and two outgoing flow-lines solving $-\nabla(f_1 - f_2)$ and $-\nabla(f_2 - f_3)$, respectively. See Figure 1. The 1-valent vertices are either critical points of the flow lines ending at the vertex, or belong to $\Pi(\Sigma)$. We give a more detailed description of flow trees in Section 2.




FIGURE 1. The local picture of a Morse flow tree Γ in a neighborhood of a 3-valent vertex, given in the front projection. The graphs of the defining functions f_1 , f_2 and f_3 are sketched, together with the lift of the tree to the sheets of Λ determined by these functions. The shaded area indicates the corresponding J -holomorphic disk.

Each edge of the tree has two lifts to Λ , one for each of the sheets corresponding to the defining functions of the edge. The 1-valent vertices which do not lift to Σ will lift to end points of Reeb chords, and the Lagrangian projection of the lift of a tree will give a closed curve in $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$.

By the results in [Ekh07] there is a one-to-one correspondence between flow trees and pseudo-holomorphic disks defined by Λ . Briefly this works as follows. Consider the fiber scaling $s_\lambda : (x, y, z) \mapsto (x, \lambda y, \lambda z)$ which pushes Λ towards the zero section. Then there is a choice of metric of M and almost complex structure of T^*M , so that after a perturbation of Λ there is a one-to-one correspondence between rigid flow trees of Λ and sequences of J -holomorphic disks u_λ in T^*M with boundary on $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(s_\lambda(\Lambda))$. The disks are characterized by the property that their boundaries are arbitrarily close to the cotangent lift of the corresponding tree Γ . Moreover, the linearized boundary conditions of the disks tend to constant $\mathbb{R}^n$ -boundary conditions, except at cusp points, where we

get a split boundary condition which is constantly $\mathbb{R}$ in the first $n - 1$ directions, and given by a uniform $\pm\pi$ -rotation in the last direction, where the sign depends on the type of vertex. In addition, when we let $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, then the domain of the disk will split up into a finite union of strips and strips with one slit. See Section 2.4.

The sign of a tree Γ will be related to orientations of the moduli spaces of pseudo-holomorphic disks u_λ , where the latter space will be given orientation by orienting the determinant lines of the linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator at the disks. This orientation, in turn, is defined by using methods from [FOOO09] and [EES05b], and is called the *capping orientation* of u_λ , denoted by $\mathcal{O}(u_\lambda)$. This orientation is related to choices of orientations of the stable and unstable manifolds of the critical points of the flow lines of Γ , and also to the chosen spin structure of Λ . For a definition of the capping orientation, see Section 5.

Using the degeneration process, i.e. when $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ and the rigid flow tree Γ (or more precisely, the disks u_λ) splits up into pieces with at most 3 punctures, we will describe an algorithm for combinatorially calculating a sign $\sigma(\Gamma)$ of Γ in the limit $\lambda = 0$. Namely, we will give the pieces of the tree orientations coming from the stable and unstable manifolds of the critical points contained in the tree. Then we glue the pieces back together again, and under this gluing we can understand the orientation of Γ as oriented intersections of flow manifolds. Due to the rigidity of Γ , we will in the end get a sign $\sigma(\Gamma)$ from these intersected submanifolds. All this is described in Section 3.

The sign $\sigma(\Gamma)$ of Γ and the capping orientation $\mathcal{O}(u_\lambda)$ of u_λ will depend on several choices. In particular, we need that Λ is spin and we will indicate the choice of spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ by $\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{s}}(u_\lambda)$, respectively.

The main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Lambda \subset J^1(M)$ be a spin Legendrian submanifold, and fix a spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ of Λ . Assume that Γ is a rigid flow tree of Λ , and let u_λ , $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, be a sequence of rigid pseudo-holomorphic disks converging to Γ in the sense of [Ekh07]. Let $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{s}}(u_\lambda)$ be the capping orientation of u_λ , analytically defined in Section 5.4, and let $\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma)$ be the combinatorially defined sign of Γ , given by the algorithm in Section 3. Then there is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{s}}(u_\lambda) = \sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma)$ for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]$.*

The oriented 0-dimensional moduli spaces of flow trees are thus in one-to-one correspondence with the oriented 0-dimensional moduli spaces of pseudo-holomorphic disks of Λ , and the orientation is preserved under the identification. This means, for example, that we can use flow trees to compute the Legendrian contact homology of Λ with $\mathbb{Z}$ -coefficients. This is one of the reasons why we give the tree Γ the orientation from the corresponding pseudo-holomorphic disk. Namely, the 1-dimensional moduli spaces of pseudo-holomorphic disks have compactifications whose boundary consists of broken 0-dimensional disks. This helps us to prove that $\partial^2 = 0$, where ∂ is the differential in Legendrian contact homology. The corresponding compactification of spaces of Morse flow trees is more complicated.

Remark 1.2. When calculating the differential ∂ in Legendrian contact homology, one has to compute an additional sign for the differential. Compare [[EES05b], Section 4.1]

where the differential is defined as

$$\partial a = \sum_{\dim \mathcal{M}_A(a; \mathbf{b})=0} (-1)^{(n-1)(|a|+1)} |\mathcal{M}_A(a; \mathbf{b})| A\mathbf{b}.$$

Here $|\mathcal{M}_A(a; \mathbf{b})|$ is the signed count of elements in the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_A(a; \mathbf{b})$ of rigid holomorphic disks, where the signs come from the capping orientations of the disks. The additional sign $(-1)^{(n-1)(|a|+1)}$ arises when we glue rigid disks together at the boundary of 1-dimensional moduli spaces.

Remark 1.3. The capping orientation of u_λ defined in this paper will differ from the capping orientation defined in [EES05b]. The reason for this is that the orientation in the present paper is easier to work with in the tree-setting, while the orientation in [EES05b] is more efficient when, for example, proving invariance of the Legendrian contact homology under Legendrian isotopies. We point out that the two different DGAs will be isomorphic, compare [EENS13] where a similar issue is discussed.

1.2. Organization of the paper. In Section 2 we give an introduction to Morse flow trees, closely following [Ekh07]. In particular, we give a description of a neighborhood of partial flow trees, understood as a submanifold of M . It is these submanifolds that we will orient when calculating $\sigma_s(\Gamma)$.

In Section 3 we define the combinatorially algorithm which gives the sign $\sigma_s(\Gamma)$, and in Section 4 we give an elementary example of how this algorithm can be used.

In Section 5 we review some background materials and also define the capping orientation of a J -holomorphic disk. We use an approach similar to the one in [EES05b], but we will use slightly different orientation conventions.

In Section 6 we give a brief outline of how to associate a family of pseudo-holomorphic disks u_λ to a rigid flow tree Γ , again following [Ekh07]. We also define the capping orientation of a flow tree Γ , which will be the orientation of a pre-glued disk associated to the tree. Indeed, in [Ekh07] it is shown that for each λ sufficiently small, there is a pre-glued disk w_λ arbitrary close to u_λ so that the boundary conditions induced by w_λ are very easy to describe explicitly. In fact, the sign $\sigma(\Gamma)$ of Γ given in Section 3 is the capping orientation of w_λ . This we prove in Section 8. In particular, this shows that the capping orientation of w_λ is independent of λ for λ sufficiently small. In Section 8.5 we prove that the capping orientation of u_λ equals the capping orientation of w_λ for λ sufficiently small, and hence Theorem 1.1 follows. The main technical results are proven in Section 7 and Section 9. In Appendix A we summarize some results concerning families of Fredholm operators.

2. MORSE FLOW TREES

In this section we give an introduction to Morse flow trees, following Ekholm in [Ekh07]. We will focus on the properties of the trees that will be of most importance for us, and refer to [Ekh07] for a deeper discussion of the subject.

We will first describe how Morse flow trees are built, see Subsection 2.1. In Subsection 2.2 we introduce partial flow trees, which are defined similar to Morse flow trees, but should be thought of as trees obtained from a Morse flow tree Γ by cutting Γ into

smaller pieces. In Subsection 2.3 we describe neighborhoods of partial flow trees, given as submanifolds of M via evaluation. It will be these submanifolds that we orient when we are defining the sign of the flow trees.

In Subsection 2.4 we describe a special type of domains associated to flow trees, and in Subsection 2.5 we give a combinatorial formula for how they affect the orientation of the tree. This formula will then be used in Section 3.

Recall that we assume Λ to be front generic and to have simple front singularities. We denote the singular set of Λ by Σ .

2.1. Flow lines and vertices. As we briefly explained in Section 1.1, Morse flow trees consist of gradient flow lines in M . These flow lines are induced by local functions related to Λ , and they are patched together to give a closed curve when lifted to T^*M . More precisely, the trees are constructed as follows.

Given a Legendrian $\Lambda \subset J^1(M)$, it is a standard fact that $\Lambda \setminus \Sigma$ locally can be given as the 1-jet lift

$$J^1(f) = \{(x, df(x), f(x)), x \in U \subset M\}$$

of a locally defined function $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Fix a Riemannian metric g on M and let ∇ denote the corresponding gradient operator. To define flow trees we will use the local functions f_i which define Λ , or more precisely, the flow lines of the gradients of their pairwise function differences. Note that these vector fields $-\nabla(f_i - f_j)$ are only locally defined on M .

Definition 2.1. A *flow line* γ of Λ is a curve $\gamma : I \rightarrow M$ satisfying

$$\dot{\gamma}(t) = -\nabla(f_1 - f_2)(\gamma(t)),$$

where f_1, f_2 is a pair of local functions determined by Λ . Here I is some interval.

Remark 2.2. A flow line is either an embedding or a constant map whose image is a critical point of $f_1 - f_2$.

Assume that γ is non-constant and that $f_1 > f_2$ along γ . Then we define the *flow orientation* of γ to be the orientation given by the vector field $-\nabla(f_1 - f_2)(\gamma(t))$.

We associate to each flow line γ its two 1-jet lifts $(\tilde{\gamma}^1, \tilde{\gamma}^2)$, given by

$$\tilde{\gamma}^i(t) = (\gamma(t), df_i(\gamma(t)), f_i(\gamma(t))) \in J^1(M), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

and also its cotangent lifts $(\bar{\gamma}^1, \bar{\gamma}^2)$ given by

$$\bar{\gamma}^i(t) = \Pi_C(\tilde{\gamma}^i(t)) \in T^*M, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

The *flow orientation* of $\tilde{\gamma}^1$ and $\tilde{\gamma}^2$ is given by the lift of the orientation of γ and $-\gamma$, respectively. See Figure 2. The flow orientation of $\bar{\gamma}^i$ is the orientation induced by the orientation of $\tilde{\gamma}^i$ under the Lagrangian projection, $i = 1, 2$.

Definition 2.3. A *Morse flow tree* of $\Lambda \subset J^1(M)$ is an immersed tree Γ in M , obtained by patching together flow lines of Λ so that the following holds.

- (1) The vertices of Γ have valence of at most 3.
- (2) The tree Γ is rooted, oriented away from the root. The orientation of the edges are given by the flow orientation. The valence of the root is equal to 1 or 2.




FIGURE 2. The front projection of 1-jet lifts of a gradient flow line.

- (3) We get an oriented closed curve $\bar{\Gamma} \subset T^*M$ when concatenating the oriented cotangent lifts of the edges of Γ .
- (4) The vertices of Γ are of the form listed in Table 1.

Definition 2.4. A vertex $v \in \Gamma$ is called a *puncture* if the 1-jet lift of Γ makes a jump at v . It is called a *negavite puncture* if we go from the upper sheet to the lower when following the lifted orientation of Γ , and it is called a *positive puncture* if we go from the lower sheet to the upper.

Remark 2.5. We will only consider trees with exactly one positive puncture, and for such trees the positive puncture coincides with the root of the tree.

Next we fix some notations. Note that if p is a puncture of a tree Γ , then it is a critical point of some local function difference $f_1 - f_2$, where we assume that $f_1 > f_2$. Denote by $W^u(p)$ and $W^s(p)$ the unstable and stable manifold, respectively, at p , with respect to the negative gradient flow of $f_1 - f_2$. That is, if $\phi : M \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow M$ is a solution of

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \phi(x, t) = -\nabla((f_1 - f_2)(\phi(x, t))), \quad \phi(x, 0) = x,$$

then

$$W^u(p) = \{x \in M; \lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} \phi(x, t) = p\}, \quad W^s(p) = \{x \in M; \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi(x, t) = p\}.$$

We define the *index* $I(p)$ of a puncture p to be the Morse index of $f_1 - f_2$. Because of our transversality assumptions we have

$$\dim(W^u(p)) = I(p), \quad \dim(W^s(p)) = n - I(p).$$

The dimension of a Morse flow tree is given as follows. Let $e(\Gamma)$ be the number of end-vertices, $s(\Gamma)$ be the number of switches, and $Y_1(\Gamma)$ the number of Y_1 -vertices of Γ .

TABLE 1. Complete list of vertices occuring in rigid flow trees.

Type	Description	Local picture of the tree and its front lift
$P_{1,+}$	<i>Positive 1-valent punctures</i> , not contained in $\Pi(\Sigma)$.	
$P_{1,-}$	<i>Negative 1-valent punctures</i> , not contained in $\Pi(\Sigma)$.	
$P_{2,+}$	<i>Positive 2-valent punctures</i> p , not contained in $\Pi(\Sigma)$, with index $I(p) = 0$.	
$P_{2,-}$	<i>Negative 2-valent punctures</i> p , not contained in $\Pi(\Sigma)$, with index $I(p) = n$.	
Y_0	<i>3-valent Y_0-vertices</i> , not contained in $\Pi(\Sigma)$ and not containing any punctures.	
end	<i>1-valent end-vertices</i> e , contained in $\Pi(\Sigma)$, not containing any punctures, meeting $\Pi(\Sigma)$ transversely, the 1-jet lift of Γ through e is traversing Σ downwards.	
switch	<i>2-valent switch-vertices</i> s , contained in $\Pi(\Sigma)$, not containing any punctures, tangent to $\Pi(\Sigma)$, one of the 1-jet lifts of Γ through v is traversing Σ upwards, the other 1-jet lift of s is not contained in Σ .	
Y_1	<i>3-valent Y_1-vertices</i> v , contained in $\Pi(\Sigma)$, not containing any punctures, meeting $\Pi(\Sigma)$ transversely, one of the 1-jet lifts of Γ through v is traversing Σ upwards, the other two 1-jet lifts of v are not contained in Σ .	

Definition 2.6. If Γ is a flow tree with positive puncture a and negative punctures $b_1, \dots, b_m$, then the dimension of Γ is given by

$$\dim(\Gamma) = 2 + \dim W^u(a) + \sum_{j=1}^m (\dim W^s(b_j) - n + 1) + e(\Gamma) - s(\Gamma) - Y_1(\Gamma).$$

In this paper we will be interested in *rigid flow trees*, i.e. trees of dimension 0 which are transversely cut out from the space of trees. For a proper definition we refer to [Ekh07].

In Legendrian contact homology, the grading of a Reeb chord plays an important role. This is defined as follows. For each Reeb chord c of Λ , let $c_+, c_- \in \Lambda \cap c$ denote the end points of c . We fix notation so that the z -coordinate of c_+ is larger than the z -coordinate of c_- . Assume that Λ is connected, and pick a *capping path* γ_c of c , which is a smooth path in Λ going from c_+ to c_- , and we choose it so that it intersects Σ transversely. Let $D(\gamma_c)$ be the number of cusps that γ_c traverses coming from the upper sheet of the cusp in direction to the lower sheet of the cusp, and let $U(\gamma_c)$ be the number of cusps that γ_c traverses coming from the lower sheet going to the upper sheet (relative the z -axis). We define the *Maslov index* $\mu(\gamma_c)$ of γ_c to be the quantity

$$\mu(\gamma_c) = D(\gamma_c) - U(\gamma_c).$$

See [EES05a].

Now define the *grading of c* to be given by

$$(2.1) \quad |c| = \mu(\gamma_c) + I(c) - 1.$$

Definition 2.7. A Reeb chord c is *odd (even)* if $|c|$ is odd (even). We say that c is *reversible* if $\mu(\gamma_c)$ is odd, and that c is *irreversible* otherwise.

Remark 2.8. Since we have a one-to-one correspondence between the Reeb chords of Λ and the double points of $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$, given by the projection, we will use these two notations interchangeably. Nor will we make any notational difference between these objects and punctures of Morse flow trees or punctures of pseudo-holomorphic disks.

2.2. Partial flow trees. It will be useful to cut rigid flow trees into simpler parts, to obtain *partial flow trees*. These trees are defined in the same way as flow trees, except that we have weakened condition (3) in Definition 2.3. Namely, we allow 1-valent vertices where the Lagrangian lifts of the tree do not match up. Such a vertex we call a *special puncture*.

We define the notion of positive and negative special punctures just as in the case of ordinary punctures of a flow tree. That is, a special puncture p is positive if the oriented 1-jet lift of Γ jumps from a lower sheet to a higher one at p , and otherwise it is a negative puncture.

If Γ is a true Morse flow tree, then the partial flow trees obtained by cutting Γ into smaller pieces are given the flow orientation from Γ . Thus, if we cut Γ at only one point, then one of the partial flow trees will have the same positive puncture as Γ , and the other tree will have its (special) positive puncture at the cutting point.

Remark 2.9. A local function difference along an edge in a rigid flow tree cannot change sign. See [Ekh07].

We will mainly be interested in a special kind of partial flow trees, which are trees obtained by cutting a rigid flow tree just once. These trees we denote *sub flow trees*. The dimension of a sub flow tree is computed similar to the case of Morse flow trees. Here $I(p) = n$ if p is a special puncture.

The sub flow trees, together with the partial flow trees listed in Table 1, will play an important role in the orientation algorithm. We will denote the latter trees by *elementary pieces*.

2.3. Description of a neighborhood of a sub flow tree. Given a sub flow tree Γ , let $\Omega = \Omega(\Gamma)$ be a neighborhood of Γ in the space of trees, and let q denote the special puncture of Γ . We define the *natural evaluation map* $\text{ev}_q : \Omega \rightarrow M$ to be given by evaluation at the special puncture q . In this section we describe the image of this map.

Definition 2.10. Let e be a flow line of a local function difference $f_1 - f_2$ and let $K \subset M$ be a subset so that $K \cap e \neq \emptyset$. Then the *flow-out of K along e* is the union of all maximal flow lines of $-\nabla(f_1 - f_2)$ that intersect K .

Now assume that Γ is a sub flow tree with a special puncture q , and let e be the edge of Γ ending at q . Let p denote the other vertex of e . We will define something called the *flow-out of Γ at q* , denoted by $\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma)$. In the case when p is a 2- or 3-valent vertex, then this is the flow-out of the corresponding *intersection manifold* $\mathcal{I}_p(\Gamma)$ along e . All this is defined inductively below, for each type of vertex p .

p a positive 1-valent puncture: then $\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma) = W^u(p)$.

p a negative 1-valent puncture: then $\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma) = W^s(p)$.

p an end: then $\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma)$ is the flow-out of D_p along e , where D_p is a co-dimension 1 disk centered at p and transverse to e .


p a 2-valent puncture: then $\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma)$ equals e . The intersection manifold $\mathcal{I}_p(\Gamma)$ of Γ at p equals p .

p a Y_0 -vertex: then the intersection manifold of Γ at p is given by $\mathcal{I}_p(\Gamma) = W_1 \cap W_2$, where W_i , $i = 1, 2$, are the flow-outs of Γ at p along the other two edges of Γ ending at p . The flow-out $\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma)$ is given by the flow-out of $\mathcal{I}_p(\Gamma) \cap D_p$ along e , where D_p is a co-dimension 1 disk centered at p and transverse to e .

p a switch: then $\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma)$ is the flow-out of $W_1 \cap \Pi(\Sigma) \cap D_p$ along e , where W_1 is the flow-out of Γ at p along the other edge of Γ ending at p , and D_p is a co-dimension 1 disk centered at p and transverse to e .

p a Y_1 -vertex: then the intersection manifold of Γ at p is given by $\mathcal{I}_p(\Gamma) = W_1 \cap W_2 \cap \Pi(\Sigma)$, where W_i , $i = 1, 2$, are the flow-outs of Γ at p along the other two edges of Γ ending at p . The flow-out $\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma)$ is given by the flow-out of $\mathcal{I}_p(\Gamma) \cap D_p$ along e , where D_p is a co-dimension 1 disk centered at p and transverse to e .

See Figure 3.


 FIGURE 3. The flow-out along Γ .

With this description we can now understand how other trees near Γ are parametrized. If q is a special puncture on an edge e , let D_q denote a co-dimension 1 disk centered at q and transverse to e .

Lemma 2.11. *Let Γ be a sub flow tree with special puncture q . Then, for sufficiently small neighborhoods Ω of Γ in the space of flow trees of Λ ,*

$$\text{ev}_q(\Omega) = (\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma) \cap D_q) \times (-\epsilon, \epsilon).$$


Here $(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ represents the degree of freedom of q to move along the flow line itself.

Proof. Follows from the proof of [[Ekh07], Proposition 3.14]. $\square$

Remark 2.12. When giving a rigid flow tree Γ its sign $\sigma(\Gamma)$ we will first orient the sub flow trees Γ' of Γ . This, in turn, is done by orientating the flow out of the tree Γ' at its special puncture q .

2.4. Standard domains. Recall the correspondence between rigid flow trees and rigid J -holomorphic disks with boundary on Λ , established in [Ekh07]. The domains of the disks are given by standard domains, which are defined as follows.

Definition 2.13. A *standard domain* $\Delta_{m+1}(\bar{\tau})$, $\bar{\tau} = (\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{m-1})$, is a subset of $\mathbb{R} \times [0, m] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ obtained by removing $m - 1$ horizontal slits starting at (τ_j, j) , $j = 1, \dots, m - 1$, and ending at ∞ . All slits look the same, they are strips ending in a half-circle of width ϵ , $0 < \epsilon \ll 1$. A point (τ_j, j) where a slit ends will be called a *boundary minimum*. See Figure 4.


 FIGURE 4. A standard domain Δ_{m+1} , $m = 5$.

Given a (partial) flow tree Γ , we can associate a standard domain $\Delta(\Gamma)$ to Γ by thinking of the boundary of the standard domain as being mapped to the 1-jet lift of

Γ . More precisely, start at the positive puncture of Γ . This represents the point p_0 at $-\infty$ of the corresponding domain. Go along the 1-jet lift of Γ , in the direction of the lifted flow-orientation. This path corresponds to the bottom line of $\Delta(\Gamma)$, connecting p_0 to p_1 , following the notation in Figure 4. At the end of this flow line we find either a negative puncture or an end-vertex, which we represent by the point p_1 at the positive infinity. Jump to the line of $\Delta(\Gamma)$ over p_1 , which represents the outgoing lifted flow line at p_1 . Follow this path. To continue this description, it helps to think of the standard domain as patched together by the (compactified) standard domains corresponding to the elementary pieces that the tree is built out of. These standard domains are given as follows, where we recall that the elementary pieces are given by the partial flow trees listed in Table 1.

Positive 1-valent puncture: A standard domain Δ_2 with the point at $-\infty$ representing the positive puncture.

Negative 1-valent puncture: A standard domain Δ_2 with the point at $+\infty$ representing the negative puncture.

Positive 2-valent puncture: A standard domain Δ_3 with the point at $-\infty$ representing the positive puncture.

Negative 2-valent puncture: A standard domain Δ_2 with one of the points at $+\infty$ representing the negative puncture.

Y_0 -vertex: A standard domain Δ_3 with the boundary minimum representing the Y_0 -vertex.

End-vertex: A standard domain Δ_2 with the point at $+\infty$ representing the end-vertex.

Switch: A standard domain Δ_2 with a point on $\partial\Delta_2$ representing the point where the 1-jet lift of the switch passes through Σ .

Y_1 -vertex: A standard domain Δ_3 with the boundary minimum representing the Y_1 -vertex.

Now, if we continue to follow the flow orientation of the 1-jet lift of Γ , we get a recipe for how to glue these elementary standard domains together to obtain $\Delta(\Gamma)$.

Remark 2.14. Given a flow tree Γ , we can not read off how the standard domain $\Delta(\Gamma)$ looks like from the immersion of Γ in M , we also need data from the 1-jet lift of Γ .

In the algorithm in Section 3 we will need to keep track of when the 1-jet lift of Γ traverses the singular set Σ of Λ . To do this, we will assign signs to the components of $\partial\Delta(\Gamma)$. This is done as follows.

- The bottom line at p_0 is equipped with a positive sign.
- Each time we meet a reversible puncture, an end-vertex, a switch point, or a boundary minimum corresponding to a Y_1 -vertex, we change sign (for 2-valent punctures this is done at the point at infinity, not at the boundary minimum).
- If we meet a boundary minimum that corresponds to a Y_0 -vertex we keep the sign. This we also do for irreversible punctures.

The following lemma assures that the signs match up at the end.

Lemma 2.15. *Let Γ be a rigid flow tree. Then we have that*

$$\# \text{ reversible punctures of } \Gamma \equiv s(\Gamma) + e(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma) \pmod{2}.$$

Proof. Given the tree Γ , we fix capping paths at all punctures except at the positive puncture p . Concatenating these paths with the 1-jet lift of Γ gives a capping path γ for p , and from Table 1 we see that each switch, end and Y_1 -vertex contributes with 1 (mod 2) to the Maslov index of γ . Thus we get that

$$\mu(\gamma) \equiv \# \text{ reversible negative punctures of } \Gamma + s(\Gamma) + e(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma) \pmod{2}.$$

Since p is reversible if and only if $\mu(\gamma) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ the result follows. $\square$

2.5. Conformal structures. Besides working with standard domains, we will sometimes consider the domain of a pseudo-holomorphic disk to be given by the punctured unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$. To that end, let D_{m+1} be the unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$ with $m+1$ marked points on the boundary, where one of them is distinguished and fixed at 1, say. Assume that $m > 1$, and let $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ denote the space of conformal structures on D_{m+1} . A standard domain $\Delta_{m+1}(\bar{\tau})$ induces a conformal structure $\kappa(\bar{\tau})$ on D_{m+1} via the Riemann mapping theorem. Here $\Delta_{m+1}(\bar{\tau})$ is given the flat metric. Moreover, since translations are biholomorphisms we get that $\kappa(\bar{\tau}) = \kappa(t + \bar{\tau})$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, where $t + \bar{\tau} = (t + \tau_1, \dots, t + \tau_{m-1})$. The action $t + \bar{\tau}$ can be seen as $\mathbb{R}$ acting on $\mathbb{R}^{m-1}$, with orbit space given by $\mathbb{R}^{m-2}$, and hence the mapping $\bar{\tau} \mapsto \kappa(\bar{\tau})$ gives an identification of $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ with $\mathbb{R}^{m-2}$ via standard domains. In [[Ekh07], Lemma 2.2] it is proven that this identification is a diffeomorphism. We give the space $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ the norm induced from the standard norm on $\mathbb{R}^{m-2}$ via this diffeomorphism.

In Section 5.2.D we discuss the orientation of the space $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$, and the orientation of Γ will depend on the orientation of this space. As explained in Section 2.4, the points $p_1, \dots, p_m$ at the positive infinity of the standard domain $\Delta(\Gamma)$ will represent the negative punctures and the end-vertices of Γ . This means that we regard the end-vertices as marked points, and by our orientation conventions, which we fix later on in this paper, we should then use the orientation of $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ given in Section 6.3. In the algorithm given in Section 3 we will use a slightly different orientation, though, which is more suitable for the inductive type of calculations performed there. Thus, at the last step of the algorithm, we must compensate for this by multiplying by a sign μ , coming from comparing these two orientations. We give a formula for μ here, referring to Section 6.3 for a more detailed explanation, and in particular to Lemma 6.14 for a proof.

Assume that Γ has l negative punctures $q_1, \dots, q_l$ and k end-vertices $e_1, \dots, e_k$. Pick indices $k_1 < \dots < k_k, l_1 < \dots < l_l$ so that $\{k_1, \dots, k_k, l_1, \dots, l_l\} = \{1, \dots, k+l\}$ and so that the ends and punctures of Γ are occurring along the boundary of $\Delta(\Gamma)$ in a way so that $p_{l_i} = q_i, i = 1, \dots, l$, and $p_{k_i} = e_i, i = 1, \dots, k$, with notation as in Figure 4. Let $m = k + l$.

For $m \geq 2$ we identify the ordered tuple $(p_3, \dots, p_m)$ with the oriented standard basis for $\mathbb{R}^{m-2}$, so that we can use wedge products of the points when computing μ .

Definition 2.16. The sign μ is given as follows.

If $l = 1$ then

$$\mu = l_1 - 1.$$

If $l \geq 2$ then we get the following cases.

$$p_1 = q_1, p_2 = q_2:$$

$$\mu = \sigma_p, \text{ where}$$

$$p_3 \wedge \cdots \wedge p_m = (-1)^{\sigma_p} p_{l_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{l_l} \wedge p_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{k_k}$$

$$p_1 = q_1, p_2 = e_1:$$

$$\mu = \sigma_p + l_2, \text{ where}$$

$$p_2 \wedge p_3 \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{l_2-1} \wedge p_{l_2+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_m = (-1)^{\sigma_p} p_{l_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{l_l} \wedge p_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{k_k}$$

$$p_1 = e_1, p_2 = q_1:$$

$$\mu = \sigma_p + l_2 + 1, \text{ where}$$

$$p_1 \wedge p_3 \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{l_2-1} \wedge p_{l_2+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_m = (-1)^{\sigma_p} p_{l_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{l_l} \wedge p_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{k_k}$$

$$p_1 = e_1, p_2 = e_2:$$

$$\mu = \sigma_p + l_1 + l_2 + 1, \text{ where}$$

$$\begin{aligned} p_1 \wedge p_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{l_1-1} \wedge p_{l_1+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{l_2-1} \wedge p_{l_2+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_m \\ = (-1)^{\sigma_p} p_{l_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{l_l} \wedge p_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge p_{k_k}. \end{aligned}$$

See Figure 5.




FIGURE 5. In this example the space of conformal structures is oriented by $q_3 \wedge e_1 \wedge e_2 = (-1)^{2+3+1} q_2 \wedge e_2 \wedge q_3$. Here $l_2 = 3$ and $\sigma_p = 2$. The vectors $t_1, \dots, t_4, v_1, v_3, v_4$ indicate the conformal variations, where $t_1 = -v_1, t_3 = v_3, t_4 = v_4$.

3. ALGORITHM FOR CALCULATING THE SIGN OF A FLOW TREE

Let Γ be a rigid flow tree of Λ . In this section we define the sign $\sigma_s(\Gamma)$ that occurs in Theorem 1.1. This is done inductively, as indicated in Section 1.1, and we start this section by giving a brief outline of the steps in the induction. In Section 8 we will prove that $\sigma_s(\Gamma)$ satisfies the statements of Theorem 1.1.

We will use the following notation. If $\tilde{\Gamma} \subset \Gamma$ is a partial flow tree, then we denote the vertices of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ that are not special punctures *true vertices*.

The induction involves orientations of the flow-outs of certain partial flow trees of Γ , and runs over the number of true vertices of the sub flow trees of Γ . For technical reasons we only allow certain sub flow trees, described below.

The induction is performed as follows.

Base case: Partial flow trees $\tilde{\Gamma}$ with only one true vertex are given an orientation that can be realized as an orientation of

- the flow-out of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ at the special puncture, if the true vertex is 1-valent;
- the intersection manifold of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ at the true vertex, if the true vertex is 2- or 3-valent.

See Section 3.3.

Inductive hypothesis: After step k we assume that all sub flow trees of Γ with at most k true vertices are given orientations. We also assume that these orientations can be realized as orientations of either the flow-outs of the trees at the special punctures, or as orientations of the intersection manifolds at the vertex adjacent to the special puncture.

Inductive step: In step $k + 1$ we create sub flow trees with $k + 1$ true vertices. This is done by gluing sub flow trees together at 3-valent vertices, or by joining a sub flow tree to a 2-valent piece. The trees in the input of the gluing are given by one of the following collection of oriented partial flow trees.

- (y0g) One Y_0 -piece, oriented as in the base step, and two sub flow trees with positive special punctures and oriented flow-outs. The sub flow trees are glued to the negative special punctures of the Y_0 -piece.
- (y1g) One Y_1 -piece, oriented as in the base step, and two sub flow trees with positive special punctures and oriented flow-outs. The sub flow trees are glued to the negative special punctures of the Y_1 -piece.
- (ng) One 2-valent negative piece, oriented as in the base step, and one sub flow tree with a positive special puncture and oriented flow-out. The sub flow tree is glued to the negative special puncture of the 2-piece.
- (sgn) One switch-piece, oriented as in the base step, and one sub flow tree with a positive special puncture and oriented flow-out. The sub flow tree is glued to the negative special puncture of the switch-piece.
- (sgp) One switch-piece, oriented as in the base step, and one sub flow tree with a negative special puncture, a true 1-valent positive puncture, $l \geq 0$ switches, and no other vertices. The latter tree has oriented flow-out at the negative special puncture. The sub flow tree is glued to the positive special puncture of the switch-piece.

To complete the induction step, we must give an orientation to the intersection manifold and the flow-out of the glued tree. This will be defined to be the oriented intersection of the trees in the input, times some additional gluing signs. See Section 3.4.

The final step: To finish the algorithm we perform the *final gluing*, in which we will recover Γ . This gluing is similar to the one in the induction step, but for technical reasons the inputs will be restricted to be of one of the following kind.

- (f0) Two sub flow trees Γ_1, Γ_2 . Here Γ_1 has one true 1-valent vertex, one positive special puncture, and no other vertices. The tree Γ_2 has a true 1-valent positive puncture, $l \geq 0$ switches, a negative special puncture and no other vertices. The orientations of Γ_1 and Γ_2 are given by orientations of their flow outs at their common special puncture.

- (f1) Two sub flow trees Γ_1, Γ_2 . Here Γ_1 has one positive special puncture p , at least 2 true vertices where the vertex q adjacent to p is not a switch, and the orientation of Γ_1 is given by the orientation of the intersection manifold at q . The tree Γ_2 has a true 1-valent positive puncture, $l \geq 0$ switches, a negative special puncture and no other vertices. The orientation of Γ_2 is given by an orientation of the flow out at the negative special puncture.
- (f2) One 2-valent positive piece, oriented as in the base step, and 2 sub flow trees Γ_1, Γ_2 . The sub flow trees have positive special punctures, and their orientations are given by oriented flow-outs at their positive punctures.

The sign $\sigma(\Gamma)$ is given by the oriented intersection of the trees in the input, times some additional gluing signs, as explained in Section 3.5.

3.1. Notation. We will use the following notation.

- In formulas where we compute signs $(-1)^\sigma$ we will perform the calculations for σ in $\mathbb{Z}_2$, and write “=” when we mean congruent modulo 2.
- If Γ is a (sub) flow tree, then we let $\text{bm}(\Gamma)$ be equal to the number of boundary minima of $\Delta(\Gamma)$.
- If V is an oriented vector space, then we use the notation $\mathcal{O}(V)$ to indicate the orientation of V .
- We let $c(\Gamma) = Y_1(\Gamma) + s(\Gamma) + e(\Gamma)$, i.e., $c(\Gamma)$ indicates the number of times Γ intersects the cusps of Λ .
- Let $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ be a basis for $\mathbb{R}^n$. When we write that a trivialization is given by $(\alpha_1 v_1, \dots, \alpha_n v_n)$ we mean the diagonal matrix

$$\text{Diag}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n),$$

given with respect to the basis $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$.

To be able to state the formulas for the gluing signs we need to decorate our sub flow trees by associating a *cuspidal subspace* $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)$ to each tree. This is done inductively and explained in the algorithm below.

3.2. Initial choices. The sign of Γ will depend on some initial choices:

- choice of spin structure on Λ ;
- choice of orientation of the base manifold M ;
- choice of orientations of the stable and unstable manifolds associated to the punctures of Γ ;
- choice of orientation of $\mathbb{C}$;
- choice of orientation of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

We fix orientations of M , $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbb{C}$, and we describe how the other choices are made in the following subsections.

Remark 3.1. That the orientation of $\mathbb{C}$ affects the sign of Γ follows from the constructions in Section 5. Indeed, to define the capping orientation of a disk u we use techniques from [FOOO09]. These techniques, in turn, use determinant line bundles associated to complex $\bar{\partial}$ -operators, which are given orientations induced by the orientation of $\mathbb{C}$.

Remark 3.2. The choice of orientation of M is in fact only a local choice. If we keep track of the local choices we can define the orientation algorithm also in the case when M is non-orientable. We will assume that the orientation of $T_p M$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$ coincide.

3.2.A. *Orientations of stable and unstable manifolds.* For each Reeb chord p of Λ , fix an orientation of $W^s(p)$, and let it induce an orientation of $W^u(p)$ via the identification

$$T_p W^u(p) \oplus T_p W^s(p) = T_p M$$

as oriented spaces. This chosen orientation of $W^s(p)$ will be the *capping orientation* of $W^s(p)$, and the induced orientation of $W^u(p)$ is then the *capping orientation* of $W^u(p)$.

3.2.B. *Trivializations.* The sign $\sigma(\Gamma)$ will depend on the chosen trivialization of $T\Lambda$ along the lifted edges of Γ , and this choice will depend on the spin structure of Λ . We describe this dependence here, following [EES05b].

Fix a spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ on Λ , and let Γ be a rigid flow tree of Λ . Then $\mathfrak{s}$ induces a trivialization $\Theta_{\mathfrak{s}} : \partial\Delta(\Gamma) \rightarrow U(n)$ of $T\Lambda$ along the Lagrangian lift of Γ in the following way. Assume that we have a triangulation of Λ such that all Reeb chord end points belong to the 0-skeleton, and so that all capping paths belong to the 1-skeleton. Choose a trivialization of $T\Lambda$ over the 1-skeleton of Λ , and extend it to the 2-skeleton using the spin structure. If $\tilde{\gamma} \subset \Lambda$ is a lifted flow line of Γ , then we homotope $\tilde{\gamma}$ to the 1-skeleton, keeping the end points fixed, and give $T\Lambda|_{\tilde{\gamma}}$ the induced trivialization. The spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ guarantees that this trivialization is unique, up to homotopy. By doing this for all lifted flow lines of Γ we obtain $\Theta_{\mathfrak{s}}$.

Next we stabilize the tangent bundle $T\Lambda$, by adding a trivial bundle with fibers consisting of two auxiliary directions $\text{Aux}_1 \oplus \text{Aux}_2 \simeq \mathbb{R}^2$, so that we obtain the *stabilized tangent bundle* $\tilde{T}\Lambda = T\Lambda \oplus \mathbb{R}^2$. Extend the spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ of $T\Lambda$ trivially over the two extra directions, continue to denote it by $\mathfrak{s}$. We also extend $\Theta_{\mathfrak{s}}$ to be equal to the identity in the auxiliary directions.

The sign $\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma)$ will depend on $\Theta_{\mathfrak{s}}$ in the following way. Assume that Θ' is another trivialization of $\tilde{T}\Lambda$ along the lift of Γ . Homotope $\Theta_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and Θ' to be equal at all Reeb chord end points. Then, for each edge γ of Γ we can compare $\Theta_{\mathfrak{s}}$ and Θ' along the Legendrian lifts $\tilde{\gamma}_1$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_2$ of γ , by considering the concatenation $\Theta_{\mathfrak{s}}^{-1} \circ \Theta'$. In this way we get two loops of trivializations associated to γ , and hence an element $\sigma(\gamma) = \sigma(\tilde{\gamma}_1) + \sigma(\tilde{\gamma}_2) \in \pi_1(SO(n+2)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$. Let

$$(3.1) \quad \beta(\mathfrak{s}, \Theta') = \sum_{\gamma} \sigma(\gamma)$$

where the sum is taken over all flow lines γ of Γ . For a more detailed description, see [[EES05b], Section 4.4].

In the algorithm given below, we will define a trivialization $\Theta' = \Theta_{\Gamma}$ of $\tilde{T}\Lambda$ along Γ in an inductive way, by patching together trivializations defined over neighborhoods of vertices. To get a trivializable boundary condition we will sometimes need to rotate this inductively defined trivialization. This is done by performing an α -rotation, which is a rotation by π in the plane spanned by ∂_{x_n} and Aux_1 in the chosen trivialization, and which is constant in the complementary subspaces. These rotations are related to the signs of the boundary components of the standard domains, defined in Section 2.4.

The trivialization Θ_Γ will in general differ from Θ_s , and we will compensate for this by adding the sign $\beta(\mathfrak{s}, \Theta_\Gamma)$ to the gluing sign at the final gluing. See Subsection 3.5.

3.3. Orientations of vertices. In this subsection we describe how the vertices of a flow tree are oriented. In what follows, if Γ is a partial flow tree, then we fix an oriented trivialization of TM along Γ and use this to identify the tangent spaces of M along Γ with $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Recall that we have associated signs to the arcs in $\partial\Delta(\Gamma)$, where $\Delta(\Gamma)$ is the standard domain corresponding to the tree Γ . See Section 2.4.

Definition 3.3 (*Orientation of 1-valent punctures*). Let Γ be a sub flow tree with a true 1-valent puncture p , a special puncture q , and no other vertices. Recall that the flow-out $\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma)$ of Γ at q is isomorphic to the unstable manifold of p in the case p is a positive puncture, and to the stable manifold of p in the case p is a negative puncture.

Trivialization:

The trivialization along Γ is given as follows. Choose an (oriented) trivialization $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n})$ of TM along Γ , so that the differentials of the defining functions of Γ are covariantly constant. Assume that the trivialization is chosen so that the k first directions corresponds to $TW^u(p)$ in the case p is a positive puncture, and to $TW^s(p)$ in the case p is a negative puncture. Lift this to a trivialization of $T\Lambda$ along Γ in both sheets of the 1-jet lift of Γ , and extend it to the auxiliary directions so that we get a trivialization given by

- $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n}, \text{Aux}_1, \text{Aux}_2)$ along the 1-jet lifts of Γ which correspond to the components of $\partial\Delta(\Gamma)$ having positive signs,
- $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n}, -\text{Aux}_1, \text{Aux}_2)$ along the 1-jet lifts of Γ which correspond to the components of $\partial\Delta(\Gamma)$ having negative signs.

Remark 3.4. If p is irreversible then both components of $\partial\Delta(\Gamma)$ have the same sign.

Orientation:

The capping orientation of Γ is given as follows.

$$p \text{ positive: } \mathcal{O}(T_q\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma)) = (-1)^{(n+1)\dim W^u(p)} \mathcal{O}(T_qW^u(p))$$

$$p \text{ negative: } \mathcal{O}(T_q\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma)) = \mathcal{O}(T_qW^s(p))$$

where $W^u(p)$ and $W^s(p)$ are given their capping orientations.

Decoration:

The cusp-subspace $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)$ is trivial.

Definition 3.5 (*Orientation of 2-valent punctures*). Let Γ be a partial flow tree with a 2-valent puncture p , special punctures q_1, q_2 , and no other vertices. Recall that the intersection manifold $\mathcal{I}_p(\Gamma)$ of Γ at p is 0-dimensional.

Notice that we have 2 types of negative 2-valent punctures, see Table 2.

Trivialization:

The trivialization along Γ is given similar to the case of 1-valent punctures.

Orientation:

The capping orientation of Γ is given by $\sigma \in \{0, 1\}$ satisfying

$$p \text{ positive: } \mathcal{O}(T_p M) = (-1)^\sigma \mathcal{O}(T_p W^s(p))$$

$$p \text{ negative: } \mathcal{O}(T_p M) = (-1)^{\sigma+\nu} \mathcal{O}(T_p W^u(p))$$

where

$\nu = n$ if p is of type 2 and either
 both the negative punctures of Γ are reversible
 or
 both the punctures of Γ different from p are reversible
 $\nu = 0$ otherwise.

Here $T_p M$ is given the orientation from M , and $T_p W^s(p)$ ($T_p W^u(p)$) is given its capping orientation.

Decoration:

The cusp-subspace $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)$ is trivial.

TABLE 2. Different types of negative 2-valent punctures.

Type	Front projection and tree	Lagrangian projection and standard domain
negative, type 1		
negative, type 2		

Definition 3.6 (*Orientation of Y_0 -vertices*). Let Γ be a partial flow tree with a Y_0 -vertex v , special punctures p_0 , p_1 and p_2 , and no other vertices. The intersection manifold of Γ is given by an n -dimensional ball B_v centered at v . We give Γ the capping orientation induced from the orientation of M .

The trivialization along Γ is given as in the case of 1-valent punctures, and the cusp-subspace is trivial.

Definition 3.7 (*Orientation of end-vertices*). Let Γ be a sub flow tree with an end-vertex e , a special positive puncture q , and no other vertices. Recall that the flow-out of Γ at q is given by a disk transverse to the flow line, of co-dimension 1, times a small interval in the flow direction.

Trivialization:

The trivialization along Γ is given as follows. Choose an (oriented) trivialization $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n})$ of TM along Γ so that $T_e\Sigma = \text{Span}(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}})$, and so that the local functions which define Γ are covariantly constant in these directions. Also assume that the trivialization is chosen so that ∂_{x_n} points in the outward normal direction of $\Pi(\Lambda_e)$ at the end point e , where Λ_e is the union of the two sheets of Λ containing e . See Figure 6. This means that when passing through the end point, the ∂_{x_n} -vector will perform a positive π -rotation, and we will have a trivialization of the boundary condition given by $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n})$ before the rotation and given by $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}}, -\partial_{x_n})$ after the rotation.

Recall that the incoming and outgoing arc of $\partial\Delta(\Gamma)$ at e have opposite signs. We perform an α -rotation just after the end point, taking $-\partial_{x_n}$ to ∂_{x_n} and $\pm \text{Aux}_1$ to $\mp \text{Aux}_1$.

More precisely, the trivialization is given as follows. Let $U(e) \subset \partial\Delta(\Gamma)$ be a neighborhood of the end point e , and choose it so that the $+\pi$ -rotation is performed in $U(e)$. Let I_1 and I_2 denote the connected components of $\partial\Delta(\Gamma) \setminus U(e)$, and assume that I_1 is mapped to the upper sheet of the lift of Γ . Let $\sigma(I_i)$ denote the sign of I_i , $i = 1, 2$. We choose the following trivialization.

- Along I_1 : $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n}, \sigma(I_1) \cdot \text{Aux}_1, \text{Aux}_2)$.
- In $U(e)$: a uniform $+\pi$ -rotation in the ∂_{x_n} -coordinate, constantly $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}}) \oplus (\sigma(I_1) \cdot \text{Aux}_1, \text{Aux}_2)$ in the other coordinates, composed with an α -rotation.
- Along I_2 : $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n}, \sigma(I_2) \cdot \text{Aux}_1, \text{Aux}_2)$.




FIGURE 6. Local coordinates at a cusp. Here p represents a switch, end or Y_1 -vertex.

Orientation:

The capping orientation of Γ is given by

$$\mathcal{O}(T_q\mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma)) = (-1)^n \mathcal{O}(T_qM)$$

where $T_q M$ is given the orientation from M .

Decoration:

The cusp-subspace $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)$ is trivial.

Definition 3.8 (*Orientation of switch-vertices*). Let Γ be a partial flow tree with a switch-vertex s , special punctures q_1, q_2 , and no other vertices.

Trivialization:

The trivialization along Γ is given similar to the case of an end-vertex, or more precisely, as follows. Let $U(s) \subset \partial\Delta(\Gamma)$ be a neighborhood of the switch-point, and choose it so that the $-\pi$ -rotation is performed in $U(s)$. Let I_1 and I_2 denote the connected components of $\partial\Delta(\Gamma)$, and assume that I_1 is mapped to the lift of Γ that passes through Σ . Let $I_{11}, I_{12} \subset I_1$ so that $I_{11} \cup (U(s) \cap I_1) \cup I_{12} = I_1$ oriented. Let $\sigma(I_i)$ denote the sign of I_i , $i = 11, 12, 2$. We choose the following trivialization.

- Along I_j : $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n}, \sigma(I_j) \cdot \text{Aux}_1, \text{Aux}_2)$, $j = 11, 12, 2$.
- In $U(s)$: A uniform $-\pi$ -rotation in the ∂_{x_n} -coordinate, constantly $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}}) \oplus (\sigma(I_{11}) \cdot \text{Aux}_1, \text{Aux}_2)$ in the other coordinates, composed with an α -rotation.

Orientation:

We define the capping orientation of Γ to given by

$$\mathcal{O}(T_s \mathcal{I}_s(\Gamma)) = -\mathcal{O}(T_s \Pi(\Sigma)).$$

Here $\Pi(\Sigma)$ is given the orientation as a boundary of $\Pi(\Lambda_s) \subset M$, where Λ_s is the sheet of Λ containing s . The projection $\Pi(\Lambda_s)$ is given the orientation from M , and the boundary is oriented by outward normal last. See Figure 6.

Decoration:

The cusp-subspace of Γ is given by $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma) = \text{Span } \partial_{x_n}$.

Remark 3.9. If we use the flat coordinates of M along Γ , then we can translate the subspaces $T_s \Pi(\Sigma)$ and $T_s \Pi(\Sigma)^\perp$ along Γ , and understand the orientation of Γ and the cusp-subspace of Γ as oriented subspaces of $T_{q_i} M$, $i = 1, 2$.

Definition 3.10 (*Orientation of Y_1 -vertices*). Let Γ be a partial flow tree with a Y_1 -vertex v , special punctures q_0, q_1, q_2 , and no other vertices.

Trivialization:

The trivialization along Γ is given similar to the case of an end-vertex, or more precisely, as follows. Let $U(v) \subset \partial\Delta(\Gamma)$ be a neighborhood of the boundary minimum of $\Delta(\Gamma)$, and choose it so that the $-\pi$ -rotation is performed in $U(v)$. Let I_1, I_2 and I_3 denote the connected components of $\partial\Delta(\Gamma)$, and assume that I_2 is mapped to the lift of Γ passing through Σ . Let $I_{21}, I_{22} \subset I_2$ so that $I_{21} \cup (U(v) \cap I_2) \cup I_{22} = I_2$ oriented. Let $\sigma(I_i)$ denote the sign of I_i , $i = 1, 21, 22, 3$. We choose the following trivialization.

- Along I_j : $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n}, \sigma(I_j) \cdot \text{Aux}_1, \text{Aux}_2)$, $j = 1, 21, 22, 3$
- In $U(v)$: A uniform $-\pi$ -rotation in the ∂_{x_n} -coordinate, constantly $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}}) \oplus (\sigma(I_{11}) \cdot \text{Aux}_1, \text{Aux}_2)$ in the other coordinates, composed with an α -rotation.

Orientation:

Recall that the intersection manifold $\mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma)$ of Γ at v is given by $\Pi(\Sigma)$. We define the capping orientation of Γ to be given by

$$\mathcal{O}(T_v\mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma)) = -\mathcal{O}(T_v\Pi(\Sigma)).$$

Here $\Pi(\Sigma)$ is given the orientation as a boundary of $\Pi(\Lambda_v) \subset M$, where Λ_v is the sheet of Λ containing v . The projection $\Pi(\Lambda_v)$ is given the orientation from M , and the boundary is oriented by outward normal last. See Figure 6.

Decoration:

The cusp-subspace of Γ is given by $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma) = \text{Span } \partial_{x_n}$.

Remark 3.11. If we use the flat coordinates of M along Γ , then we can translate the subspaces $T_v\Pi(\Sigma)$ and $T_v\Pi(\Sigma)^\perp$ along Γ , and understand the orientation and the cusp-subspace of Γ as oriented subspaces of $T_{p_i}M$, $i = 1, 2, 3$.

3.4. Calculating the orientation under gluing. In this section we describe the algorithm for calculating the orientation of a sub flow tree Γ . We assume that Γ is obtained by one of the gluings (y0g) – (sgp). That is, Γ is created either by gluing two sub flow trees Γ_1, Γ_2 to a Y_0 - or Y_1 -piece, or by gluing a sub flow tree Γ_1 to a switch- or negative 2-piece. We will assume that Γ_1 and Γ_2 have special punctures p_1 and p_2 , respectively.

We will inductively assume the following.

- The sub flow trees Γ_1 and Γ_2 are given orientations represented by an orientation of $T_{p_i}\mathcal{F}_{p_i}(\Gamma_i)$, $i = 1, 2$.
- The elementary pieces are given orientations as described in Section 3.3.
- All partial flow trees that are given as inputs in the gluing have been assigned with trivializations. These trivializations are assumed to be constantly equal to the identity in neighborhoods of the special punctures in directions corresponding to Λ . Moreover, we assume that the different signs of the trivializations in the auxiliary directions match up at the gluing. Thus, the glued tree gets a well-defined trivialization induced by the gluing.

When calculating the orientation of the glued tree Γ , we will use Lemma 2.11 repeatedly. That is, we will first give the intersection manifold of Γ at the vertex we are gluing an orientation, and then we will add the flow direction and give the corresponding flow out an orientation.

From the inductively description of the intersection manifold of Γ it follows that its orientation can be calculated from an oriented intersection of submanifolds. Moreover, these oriented submanifolds correspond to flow manifolds of the trees given as input in the gluing, where the orientations correspond to the orientations of the trees. To calculate the orientation of the intersection manifold of Γ we will make use of the following orientation rule.

3.4.A. *Intersection orientation.* Assume that $V_1, V_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are subspaces so that the sequence

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & V & \rightarrow & V_1 \oplus V_2 & \rightarrow & \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow 0 \\ & & v & \mapsto & (v, v) & & \\ & & & & (u, w) & \mapsto & w - u, \end{array}$$

is exact, where $V = V_1 \cap V_2$. Assume that V_1 and V_2 are oriented. Choose an orientation $\mathcal{O}_c(V)$ of V , and let $\tilde{V}_i \subset V_i$, $i = 1, 2$, be oriented subspaces so that

$$(3.3) \quad V_i = V \oplus \tilde{V}_i \quad \text{oriented}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Then there is a $\nu \in \{0, 1\}$ so that

$$(3.4) \quad V \oplus \tilde{V}_1 \oplus \tilde{V}_2 = (-1)^\nu \mathbb{R}^n \quad \text{oriented}.$$

We define the *intersection orientation* $\mathcal{O}_{\text{int}}(V)$ of V to be given by

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{int}}(V) = (-1)^\nu \mathcal{O}_c(V).$$

The intersection orientation of the intersection manifold of Γ will in general not give the correct orientation of Γ , but we have to multiply this orientation by some additional signs. These signs depend on the type of gluing, and we give explicit formulas for them below, case by case. For an analytic derivation of these signs, we refer to Section 8.

In what follows, we will use the flat metric and parallel transport over the elementary pieces to identify tangent spaces of M .

3.4.B. *Gluing at a Y_0 -vertex.* Here we consider the problem of gluing two sub flow trees Γ_1 and Γ_2 together via a Y_0 -piece Γ_v , to obtain a sub flow tree Γ . This corresponds to the gluing (y0g). We start by setting up the notation, see Figure 7.

- Order the punctures p_0, p_1, p_2 of Γ_v using the notation in Section 2.4.
- Assume that Γ_1, Γ_2 are numbered so that Γ_i is attached to Γ_v at p_i , $i = 1, 2$.
- Recall that the intersection manifold of Γ at v is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma) = \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1) \cap \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_2),$$

and that the flow-out of Γ at p_0 is given by the flow-out of $\mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma)$ along e_0 . Here v denotes the Y_0 -vertex we are gluing at, and e_0 is the edge of Γ_v connecting p_0 to v .

- Assume that the intersection orientation of $T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1) \cap T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_2)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{int}}(T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1) \cap T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_2)) = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m.$$

Here $T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_i)$ is given the inductively defined orientation of Γ_i , $i = 1, 2$.

The orientation of Γ is defined as follows.

Definition 3.12 (*Gluing at a Y_0 -vertex*).

The intersection manifold $\mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma)$ is given the orientation

$$\mathcal{O}(T_v \mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma)) = (-1)^\nu v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m,$$




FIGURE 7. Gluing of two trees at a Y_0 -vertex. The dashed disks are the flow-outs of the trees, intersected with a co-dimensional 1 disk transverse to the tree. The vector w added when considering the flow-out of the glued tree is indicated in the second picture.

where

$$\begin{aligned} \nu &= e(\Gamma_2) \cdot [n + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + c(\Gamma_1) + \text{bm}(\Gamma_1) + \dim \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1)] \\ &\quad + [n + e(\Gamma_1)] \cdot [s(\Gamma_2) + Y_1(\Gamma_2)] + \text{bm}(\Gamma_2) \cdot [n + \dim \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1)]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, let w denote the covariantly constant unit vector field on M along e_0 , pointing in the direction of p_0 . Then the flow-out $\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma)$ is given the orientation

$$\mathcal{O}(T_{p_0}\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma)) = (-1)^{\tilde{\nu}} v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m \wedge w,$$

where

$$\tilde{\nu} = \nu + \text{bm}(\Gamma_2) + 1.$$

Remark 3.13. Note that, by rigidity, we have $w \notin \text{Span}(v_1, \dots, v_m)$.

The cusp-subspace of Γ is given by $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_2)$.

Example. Consider the situation given in Figure 7. Here we have

$$T_v\mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1) = \text{Span}(x_1, x_2), \quad T_v\mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_2) = \text{Span}(x_1, x_2, x_3),$$

and we assume that these identifications are described by oriented bases. Also assume that $c(\Gamma) = 0$. It follows that the orientation of the intersection manifold of Γ at v is given by $(-1)^\nu x_1 \wedge x_2$, where

$$\nu = 2 \cdot (3 + 2) = 0.$$

The orientation of the flow-out of Γ is then given by $(-1)^{\tilde{\nu}} x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3$, where

$$\tilde{\nu} = 0 + 2 + 1 = 1,$$

i.e., the orientation of Γ is given by $-x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3$.

3.4.C. *Gluing at a negative 2-valent puncture.* Now we glue a sub flow tree Γ_1 to a 2-piece Γ_q , to obtain a sub flow tree Γ . Here q is a negative 2-valent puncture. This corresponds to the gluing (ng). For the case of a positive 2-valent puncture, see Section 3.5.

We use the following notation, compare Figure 8.

- Let p_0 be the positive special puncture of Γ_q , and let p_1 denote the negative special puncture, to which Γ_1 is attached. Let e_0 be the edge of Γ_q connecting p_0 and q .
- Recall that the intersection manifold $\mathcal{I}_q(\Gamma_q)$ is 0-dimensional. Let $\sigma_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ so that

$$\mathcal{O}(T_q \mathcal{I}_q(\Gamma_q)) = (-1)^{\sigma_1}.$$

- Let $\sigma_2 \in \{0, 1\}$ so that

$$\mathcal{O}(T_{p_1} \mathcal{F}_{p_1}(\Gamma_1)) = (-1)^{\sigma_2} \mathcal{O}(T_{p_1} M)$$

where $T_{p_1} M$ is given the orientation from M and $T_{p_1} \mathcal{F}_{p_1}(\Gamma_1)$ is given the inductively defined orientation of Γ_1 .




FIGURE 8. Gluing a sub flow tree Γ_1 to a 2-valent negative puncture.

The orientation of Γ is defined as follows. Recall that there are two different types of negative 2-valent punctures, see Table 2.

Definition 3.14 (*Gluing at a negative 2-valent puncture*).

The intersection manifold of Γ , which is trivial, is given the orientation

$$\mathcal{O}(T_q \mathcal{I}_q(\Gamma)) = (-1)^\sigma$$

where

$$\sigma = \begin{cases} \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + n \cdot [\text{bm}(\Gamma_1) + e(\Gamma_1)] & \text{if } q \text{ is of type 1,} \\ \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 & \text{if } q \text{ is of type 2.} \end{cases}$$

Moreover, let w denote the covariantly constant unit vector field on M along e_0 , pointing in the direction of p_0 . Then the flow-out of Γ at p_0 is given the orientation

$$\mathcal{O}(T_{p_0}(\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma))) = (-1)^{\tilde{\nu}w}$$

where

$$\tilde{\nu} = \begin{cases} \sigma + \text{bm}(\Gamma_1) + 1 & \text{if } q \text{ is of type 1,} \\ \sigma + 1 & \text{if } q \text{ is of type 2.} \end{cases}$$

The cusp-subspace of Γ is given by $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_q)$.

3.4.D. *Gluing at a Y_1 -vertex.* In this section we glue two sub flow trees Γ_1 and Γ_2 together via a Y_1 -piece Γ_v , to obtain a sub flow tree Γ . This corresponds to the gluing (y1g).

We use the following notation, see Figure 9.

- Order the punctures p_0, p_1, p_2 of Γ_v using the notation in Section 2.4.
- Assume that Γ_1, Γ_2 are numbered so that Γ_i is attached to Γ_v at p_i , $i = 1, 2$.
- Recall that the intersection manifold of Γ at v is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma) = \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1) \cap \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_2) \cap \Pi(\Sigma),$$

and that the flow-out of Γ at p_0 is given by the flow-out of $\mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma)$ along e_0 . Here v denotes the Y_1 -vertex we are gluing at, and e_0 is the edge of Γ_v connecting p_0 to v .

- Assume that the intersection orientation of $T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1) \cap T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_2) \cap T_v \Pi(\Sigma)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{int}}(T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1) \cap (T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_2) \cap T_v \mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma_v))) = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m,$$

where the intermediate space $T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_2) \cap T_v \mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma_v)$ is given the intersection orientation from $T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_2)$ and $T_v \mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma_v) \simeq T_v \Pi(\Sigma)$. Here $T_v \mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma_v)$ and $T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_i)$ are given the inductively defined orientation of Γ_v and Γ_i , $i = 1, 2$, respectively.




FIGURE 9. Gluing of two trees at a Y_1 -vertex. The dashed disks are the flow-outs of the trees, intersected with a co-dimensional 1 disk transverse to the tree. The vector w added when considering the flow-out of the glued tree is indicated in the second picture.

The orientation of Γ is defined as follows.

Definition 3.15 (*Gluing at a Y_1 -vertex*).

The intersection manifold $\mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma)$ is given the orientation

$$\mathcal{O}(T_v \mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma)) = (-1)^\nu v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \nu = & e(\Gamma_1) + e(\Gamma_2) \\ & + e(\Gamma_2) \cdot [n + \dim \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1) + c(\Gamma_1) + \text{bm}(\Gamma_1) + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1)] \\ & + [n + e(\Gamma_1)] \cdot [s(\Gamma_2) + Y_1(\Gamma_2)] + \text{bm}(\Gamma_2) \cdot [n + \dim \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1)]. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, let w denote the covariantly constant unit vector field on M along e_0 , pointing in the direction of p_0 . Then the flow-out $\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma)$ is given the orientation

$$\mathcal{O}(T_{p_0}\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma)) = (-1)^{\tilde{\nu}} v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m \wedge w,$$

where

$$\tilde{\nu} = \nu + \text{bm}(\Gamma_2) + 1.$$

Remark 3.16. Note that, by rigidity, we have $w \notin \text{Span}(v_1, \dots, v_m)$.

The cusp-subspace of Γ is given by $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_2) + \text{Span}(w)$.

3.4.E. *Gluing at a switch-piece, gluing at the negative special puncture.* Here we glue a sub flow tree Γ_1 with a positive special puncture to a switch-piece Γ_s , to obtain a sub flow tree Γ . This corresponds to the gluing (sgn).

We use the following notation, see Figure 10.

- Let p_0 be the positive special puncture of Γ_s , and let p_1 denote the negative special puncture, to which Γ_1 is attached. Let s denote the switch point of Γ_s .
- Recall that the intersection manifold of Γ at s is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_s(\Gamma) = \mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_1) \cap \Pi(\Sigma) \cap D_s,$$

where D_s is a co-dimension 1 disk centered at s and transverse to Γ . Thus the tangent space of the flow-out of Γ at p_0 can be identified with the tangent space of $\mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_1) \cap \Pi(\Sigma)$ at s , using flat coordinates over Γ_s .

- Assume that the intersection orientation of $T_s\mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_1) \cap T_s\mathcal{I}_s(\Gamma_s)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{int}}(T_s\mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_1) \cap T_s\mathcal{I}_s(\Gamma_s)) = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m.$$

Here $T_s\mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_1)$ is given the inductively defined orientation of Γ_1 , and $T_s\mathcal{I}_s(\Gamma_s) \simeq T_s\Pi(\Sigma)$ is given the orientation of Γ_s .




FIGURE 10. Gluing a sub flow tree Γ_1 to a switch.

Remark 3.17. Here we assume that Γ cannot be completed to a rigid flow tree by gluing it to a sub flow tree with only 2 punctures. For that case see below.

Remark 3.18. Due to our conventions concerning the final gluing, we do not need to specify the orientation of the intersection manifold of Γ at s .

The orientation of Γ is defined as follows.

Definition 3.19 (*Gluing at a switch-piece, at the negative special puncture*).

The flow-out $\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma)$ of Γ is given the orientation

$$\mathcal{O}(T_{p_0}\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma)) = (-1)^\nu v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m,$$

where

$$\nu = n + e(\Gamma_1).$$

The cusp-subspace of Γ is given by $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_s)$.

3.4.F. *Gluing at a switch-piece, gluing at the positive special puncture.* In this section we glue a sub flow tree Γ_2 with a negative special puncture to a switch-piece Γ_s , to obtain a sub flow tree Γ . We assume that Γ_2 is a sub flow tree consisting of one positive 1-valent puncture and l switches, $l \geq 0$, and no further vertices except for the negative special puncture. This corresponds to the gluing (sgp).

We start by fixing the notation, see Figure 11.

- Let p_1 be the negative special puncture of Γ_s , and let p_0 denote the positive special puncture, to which Γ_2 is attached. Let s denote the switch point of Γ_s .
- Recall that the intersection manifold of Γ at s is given by

$$\mathcal{I}_s(\Gamma) = \Pi(\Sigma) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_2) \cap D_s,$$

where D_s is a co-dimension 1 disk centered at s and transverse to Γ . Thus the tangent space of the flow-out of Γ at p_0 can be identified with the tangent space of $\Pi(\Sigma) \cap \mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_2)$ at s , using flat coordinates over Γ_s .

- Assume that the intersection orientation of $T_s\mathcal{I}_s(\Gamma_s) \cap T_s\mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_2)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{int}}(T_s\mathcal{I}_s(\Gamma_s) \cap T_s\mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_2)) = v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m.$$

Here $T_s\mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_2)$ is given the inductively defined orientation of Γ_2 , and $T_s\mathcal{I}_s(\Gamma_s) \simeq T_s\Pi(\Sigma)$ is given the orientation of Γ_s .




FIGURE 11. Gluing a sub flow tree Γ_2 to a switch.

The orientation of Γ is defined as follows.

Definition 3.20 (*Gluing at a switch-piece, at the positive special puncture*).

The flow-out $\mathcal{F}_{p_1}(\Gamma)$ of Γ is given the orientation

$$\mathcal{O}(T_{p_1}\mathcal{F}_{p_1}(\Gamma)) = (-1)^\nu v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_m,$$

where

$$\nu = n \cdot s(\Gamma_2).$$

The cusp-subspace of Γ is given by $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_s) + \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_2)$.

3.5. The final gluing, giving the sign of a rigid flow tree. In this section we describe the last step of the algorithm, which will give us the sign $\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma)$ of the rigid flow tree Γ .

It remains to glue the positive puncture of Γ to the rest of the tree. This gluing is divided into the 3 different cases (f0)–(f2), depending on the valence of the positive puncture, and also on the dimension of the automorphism group of the standard domain associated to the tree. Notice that the latter depends on the number of boundary minima of $\Delta(\Gamma)$. That is, the automorphism group is trivial if and only if $\Delta(\Gamma)$ is a strip with no slits. In particular, if the automorphism group is non-trivial, then the positive puncture is 1-valent.

Recall the following inductive assumptions.

- The partial flow trees are given orientations that can be realized as orientations of the corresponding flow-outs or intersection manifolds.
- There are inductively defined trivializations associated to the partial flow trees, and these trivializations can be glued to a well-defined trivialization Θ_Γ of Γ .

We let $\beta(\mathfrak{s}, \Theta_\Gamma) \in \{0, 1\}$ be given as in formula (3.1).

Next we describe the final gluing in more detail, case by case, and give a formula for the sign $\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma)$ in each of the cases.

3.5.A. Trees with non-trivial automorphism group. We start with the special case of rigid trees whose associated standard domain is a strip without boundary minima. These trees have a 1-valent positive puncture, $0 \leq l \leq n - 1$ switches, one negative 1-valent puncture or an end, and no other vertices. This corresponds to the gluing (f0).

We will use the following notation.

- Let $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma$ denote the sub flow tree with one edge and one special positive puncture p_0 , say. Denote the other vertex of Γ_1 by p , and note that it represents either an end or a negative 1-valent puncture.
- Let $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_1$. That is, Γ_2 contains the switches and the true positive puncture of Γ , and has p_0 as special negative puncture.
- Assume that the flow direction of the edge of Γ_1 (connecting p_0 to p) is given by $+\partial_{x_1}$.
- Assume that the intersection orientation of $T_{p_0}\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma_1) \cap T_{p_0}\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma_2)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{int}}(T_{p_0}\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma_1) \cap T_{p_0}\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma_2)) = (-1)^{\sigma_1} \partial_{x_1},$$

where $T_{p_0}\mathcal{F}_{p_0}(\Gamma_i)$ is given the inductively defined orientation of Γ_i , $i = 1, 2$.

Definition 3.21 (*Finish, non-trivial automorphism group*).

The sign $\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma)$ of Γ is given by

$$\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma) = (-1)^{\sigma_1 + \beta(\mathfrak{s}, \Theta_\Gamma)}.$$

3.5.B. *Trees with trivial automorphism group, the positive puncture is 1-valent.* Let Γ be a rigid flow tree with a 1-valent positive puncture, and with an associated standard domain that has at least one boundary minimum. We use the following notation, compare Figure 12.

- Let v denote the first vertex of Γ that we meet when going along Γ , starting at the positive puncture a , satisfying that v is not a switch.
- Let p denote a point on the oriented edge of Γ starting at v , oriented against the flow orientation (so that it is oriented towards a).
- Let Γ_1 denote the sub flow tree of Γ having p as special positive puncture.
- Let $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma \setminus \Gamma_1$, so that the true vertices of Γ_2 are given by switches and the true positive puncture of Γ .
- Let $\nu_1 \in \{0, 1\}$ so that

$$T_p M = (-1)^{\nu_1} T_p \mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma_1) \oplus T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_2) \quad \text{oriented,}$$

where we use the flat coordinates to identify $T_p \mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma_1) \simeq T_v \mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma_1)$.




FIGURE 12. The final gluing, giving the rigid flow tree. In this case $j = 3$.

This corresponds to the gluing (f1).

Definition 3.22 (*Finish, 1-valent, trivial automorphism group*).

The sign $\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma)$ of Γ is given by

$$(3.5) \quad \sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma) = (-1)^{\sigma}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma = & \nu_1 + [e(\Gamma_1) + n] \cdot [s(\Gamma_1) + Y_1(\Gamma_1)] + [e(\Gamma) + 1] \cdot [s(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma) + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)] \\ & + e(\Gamma) \cdot [\text{bm}(\Gamma) + 1] + k(e) \cdot [c(\Gamma) + 1] + j + 1 + \mu + \beta(\mathfrak{s}, \Theta_{\Gamma}). \end{aligned}$$

Here

- j is the order of the boundary minimum of Γ with smallest τ -value,
- $\mu \in \{0, 1\}$ is given in Definition 2.16,
- $k(e) = \min\{n, e(\Gamma)\}$,
- $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_2)$.

3.5.C. *Trees with trivial automorphism group, the positive puncture is 2-valent.* Let Γ be a rigid flow tree with a 2-valent positive puncture a . Let p_1, p_2 be points on each of the edges of Γ that contains a . By cutting Γ at these points we get the following 3 partial flow trees.

- An elementary tree Γ_a that contains the positive 2-valent puncture a , and has p_1 and p_2 as negative special punctures.
- Sub flow trees Γ_i with p_i as a positive special puncture, $i = 1, 2$.

We use the following notation, see Figure 13.

- Let Γ_1 denote the sub flow tree that corresponds to the lower part of the standard domain of Γ .
- Let $\nu_0 \in \{0, 1\}$ so that

$$T_a \mathcal{I}_a(\Gamma_a) = (-1)^{\nu_0}.$$

- Let $\nu_i \in \{0, 1\}$ so that

$$\mathcal{O}(T_{p_i} M) = (-1)^{\nu_i} \mathcal{O}(T_{p_i} \mathcal{F}_{p_i}(\Gamma_i)), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

where $T_p M$ is given the orientation from M , and $T_{p_i} \mathcal{F}_{p_i}(\Gamma_i)$ is given the inductively defined orientation of Γ_i , $i = 1, 2$.

This corresponds to the gluing (f2).




FIGURE 13. The final gluing when the positive puncture is 2-valent. In this example $j = 5$.

Remark 3.23. Notice that in this case we cannot have a switch adjacent to the positive puncture, because of transversality reasons.

Definition 3.24 (*Finish, 2-valent*).

The sign $\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma)$ of Γ is given by

$$\sigma_{\mathfrak{s}}(\Gamma) = (-1)^{\sigma},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma = & e(\Gamma_2) \cdot [\dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + c(\Gamma_1) + \text{bm}(\Gamma_2)] + n \cdot [s(\Gamma_1) + Y_1(\Gamma_1)] + s(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma) \\ & + e(\Gamma_1) \cdot [s(\Gamma_2) + Y_1(\Gamma_2) + \text{bm}(\Gamma_1) + \text{bm}(\Gamma_2)] + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) \cdot [e(\Gamma) + 1] \\ & + k(e) \cdot [k(e) + c(\Gamma)] + j + 1 + \mu + \beta(\mathfrak{s}, \Theta_\Gamma) + \nu_0 + \nu_1 + \nu_2. \end{aligned}$$

Here

- j is the order of the boundary minimum of Γ with smallest τ -value, i.e. v_j is the boundary minimum at which Γ_1 and Γ_2 are glued,
- $\mu \in \{0, 1\}$ is given in Definition (2.16),
- $k(e) = \min\{n, e(\Gamma)\}$,
- $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_2)$.

4. AN EXAMPLE

In this section we calculate the signs of some of the flow trees occurring in [[Ekh07], Section 7]. First we recall the set up given there, and we modify it slightly to give rigid flow trees.

We consider two fronts F_1, F_2 in $J^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, where F_1 is given by the 0-section, and F_2 is given by the 1-jet lift of $f(x_1, x_2) = K - x_1$, $K \gg 0$. We consider the restriction of these fronts to the square $-R \leq |x_j| \leq R$, $j = 1, 2$. This gives rise to a 1-parameter family of Morse flow lines in the square.

We perturb the front F_2 slightly, so that we get a Reeb chord a at $(-R, 0)$ of index 1, and a Reeb chord b at $(R, 0)$ of index 2, and so that we have exactly one gradient flow line connecting a to b , given by the x_1 -axis restricted to the square. Thus we get a rigid flow tree Γ with positive puncture a and negative puncture b .

Now we perform the Legendrian isotopy of the 0-section described in [Ekh07], and given in Figure 14. By moving this construction in the x_2 -direction, we get the flow trees in Figure 15 and Figure 16, and they will be rigid. We denote them by Γ_A and Γ_B , respectively.

We will compute the orientations of Γ , Γ_A and Γ_B . Since rigid flow trees can be used to define the differential in Legendrian contact homology, see e.g. [Ekh07], [EES05b] and [EES07], and since this homology theory gives an invariant for Legendrian submanifolds, it is expected that the signs of Γ , Γ_A and Γ_B all coincide.




FIGURE 14. The 0-section after the Legendrian isotopy, to the left a cross-section and to the right the top-view.




FIGURE 15. In the top picture we find the lift of the flow lines of Γ_A to the isotoped 0-section. To the left we find the tree Γ_A drawn in $\mathbb{R}^2$, together with the projection of the cusps. To the right we see the corresponding standard domain.




FIGURE 16. In the top picture we find the lift of the flow lines of Γ_B to the isotoped 0-section. To the left we find the tree Γ_B drawn in $\mathbb{R}^2$, together with the projection of the cusps. To the right we see the corresponding standard domain.

4.1. Initial choices. We will assume that both a and b are irreversible. Then we can lift the trivialization of $T\mathbb{R}^2$ along Γ to both the Legendrian sheets, to get a trivialization that we might assume to coincide with the one induced by the spin structure.

To choose capping orientations of the stable and unstable manifolds associated to a and b , we note that

$$\begin{aligned} T_a W^u(a) &= \text{Span}(\partial_{x_1}) & T_a W^s(a) &= \text{Span}(\partial_{x_2}) \\ T_b W^u(b) &= 0 & T_b W^s(b) &= \text{Span}(\partial_{x_1}, \partial_{x_2}). \end{aligned}$$

We choose the following orientations of the stable manifolds

$$\mathcal{O}(T_a W^s(a)) = +\partial_{x_2} \quad \mathcal{O}(T_b W^s(b)) = \partial_{x_1} \wedge \partial_{x_2},$$

and hence we get the induced orientations

$$\mathcal{O}(T_a W^u(a)) = +\partial_{x_1} \quad \mathcal{O}(T_b W^u(b)) = +0.$$

4.2. Orientation of Γ . We divide Γ into two sub flow trees, at $p = (0, 0)$, say. Let Γ_a denote the tree with puncture a , and Γ_b the tree with puncture b .

From Definition 3.3 it follows that the capping orientation of Γ_a is given by

$$\mathcal{O}(T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_a)) = -\partial_{x_1}$$

and that the capping orientation of Γ_b is given by

$$\mathcal{O}(T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_b)) = \partial_{x_1} \wedge \partial_{x_2}.$$

Now we glue Γ_a and Γ_b back together at p , to recover the capping orientation of Γ . We see that

$$T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_b) \cap T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_a) = \text{Span}(\partial_{x_1})$$

and if we give this space the orientation from $v = -\partial_{x_1}$, then $v \wedge (-\partial_{x_2})$ gives the capping orientation of Γ_B , and the equation (3.4) reads

$$v \wedge (-\partial_{x_2}) = (-1)^0 \partial_{x_1} \wedge \partial_{x_2}.$$

Hence the intersection orientation of Γ is given by $-\partial_{x_1}$, and since $\beta(\mathfrak{s}, \Theta_\Gamma) = 0$, it follows from Definition 3.21 together with Theorem 1.1 that the capping orientation of Γ is given by -1 .

4.3. Orientation of Γ_A . In this case we have a tree with vertices given by a positive puncture a , a negative puncture b , a switch s , a Y_0 -vertex v , and an end e . See Figure 15, where we also find the corresponding standard domain.

Again we divide the tree into elementary pieces, in this case Γ_a , Γ_b , Γ_s , Γ_v and Γ_e , where the index indicates the vertex of the piece. We will orient these pieces, and then glue them together, again by using the algorithm given in Section 3.

From Section 3.3 we see that the pieces should be given the following orientation.

- The pieces Γ_a and Γ_b are oriented in the same way as when we calculated the orientation of Γ .
- The pieces Γ_v and Γ_e are given the orientation $\partial_{x_1} \wedge \partial_{x_2}$. We notice that we have an α -rotation over the latter piece.
- To orient Γ_s , consider Figure 15, where the arrow w_2 indicates the cusp-subspace (it gives the outward normal of $\Pi(\Lambda_s)$), and $w_1 \simeq -\partial_{x_1} - \partial_{x_2}$ indicates the orientation of $T_s \Pi(\Sigma)$, oriented as the boundary of $\Pi(\Lambda_s)$. Hence we get that

$$\mathcal{O}(\Gamma_s) = -w_1 = \partial_{x_1} + \partial_{x_2}.$$

We also have an α -rotation over this piece.

Now we are ready to glue. The algorithm tells us that we should start by gluing Γ_b to Γ_s , to get a sub flow tree Γ_{bs} . First we calculate the intersection orientation of

$$T_s W\mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_b) \cap T_s \mathcal{I}_s(\Gamma_s) = \text{Span}(w_1),$$

see Definition 3.19. Similar to when we computed the intersection orientation in the preceding paragraph, we see that in this case it is given by $-w_1$. Hence the orientation of Γ_{bs} is given by $(-1)^{1+2+0}w_1 = -w_1$. The cusp-subspace is given by $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_{bs}) = \text{Span}(w_2)$.

Next we glue Γ_{bs} to Γ_e via Γ_v , to obtain the sub flow tree Γ_{bsve} . In this case we have $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_{bs}$, $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_e$. We get that the intersection orientation of

$$T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_{bs}) \cap T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_e) = \text{Span}(w_1)$$

is given by $-w_1$. From Definition 3.12 we then get that the orientation of Γ_{bsve} is given by $(-1)^{\sigma_1}w_1$, where

$$\sigma_1 = 1 + 1 \cdot (2 + 1 + 1 + 0 + 1) + (2 + 0) \cdot 0 + 0 = 0.$$

The cusp-subspace is given by $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_{bsve}) = \text{Span}(w_2)$.

Now it is time for the final gluing. Recall that the capping orientation of Γ_a is given by $-\partial_{x_1}$, and that $w_1 \approx -\partial_{x_1} - \partial_{x_2}$ in the chosen trivialization. Thus the orientation of $T_p \mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma_{bsve}) \oplus T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_a)$ is given by

$$(-\partial_{x_1} - \partial_{x_2}) \wedge (-\partial_{x_1}) = (-1)^1 \partial_{x_1} \wedge \partial_{x_2},$$

so $\nu_1 = 1$, following the notation in Definition 3.22. Here p is the point at which we glue Γ_a to Γ_{bsve} . Moreover, $\beta(s, \Theta_\Gamma) = 1 + 1$ since we have two α -rotations, and $\mu = 0$.

It follows that the capping orientation of Γ_A is given by $(-1)^\sigma$, where

$$\sigma = 1 + (1 + 2) \cdot 1 + (1 + 1) \cdot (1 + 1) + 1 \cdot 0 + 1 \cdot (2 + 1) + 1 + 1 + 0 + 0 = 1.$$

Thus we get that the sign of Γ_A is given by $\sigma_s(\Gamma_A) = -1$.

4.4. Orientation of Γ_B . In this case we have a tree with vertices given by a positive puncture a , a negative puncture b , a switch s , a Y_0 -vertex v_0 , a Y_1 -vertex v_1 , and two ends e_1, e_2 . See Figure 16, where we also find the corresponding standard domain.

Again we divide the tree into the corresponding elementary pieces $\Gamma_a, \Gamma_b, \Gamma_s, \Gamma_{v_0}, \Gamma_{v_1}, \Gamma_{e_1}$ and Γ_{e_2} , so that we can orient each piece and then glue them back together again.

The orientation of the pieces, except for Γ_{v_1} , is given as in the Γ_A -case. To orient Γ_{v_1} , consider Figure 16, where the arrow u_2 indicates the cusp-subspace at v_1 (it gives the outward normal of $\Pi(\Lambda_{v_1})$), and $u_1 \simeq \partial_{x_2}$ indicates the orientation of $T_{v_1} \Pi(\Sigma)$, oriented as the boundary of $\Pi(\Lambda_{v_1})$. Hence we get that

$$\mathcal{O}(\Gamma_{v_1}) = -u_1 = -\partial_{x_2}.$$

We also have an α -rotation over this piece.

Now we glue, and we notice that the first and second gluing is similar to the Γ_A -case. But now, in the Γ_B -case, we have to stabilize the tree $\Gamma_{bsv_0e_1}$ after the gluing, by adding

the vector field w described in Definition 3.12. This vector can now be represented by w_2 . Thus we get that the flow-out of $\Gamma_{bsv_0e_1}$ is given the orientation

$$(-1)^{0+0+1}w_1 \wedge w_2 = -w_1 \wedge w_2.$$

Now we glue this tree to e_2 via the vertex v_1 , to obtain a sub flow tree $\Gamma_{B'}$. Following the algorithm, Definition 3.15 tells us that we should first compute the intersection orientation of

$$(4.1) \quad T_{v_1}\mathcal{F}_{v_1}(\Gamma_{e_2}) \cap T_{v_1}\mathcal{I}_{v_1}(\Gamma_{v_1}) = \text{Span}(u_1)$$

which is seen to be given by $-u_1$, and then use this to compute the intersection orientation of

$$(4.2) \quad T_{v_1}\mathcal{F}_{v_1}(\Gamma_{bsv_0e_1}) \cap (T_{v_1}\mathcal{F}_{v_1}(\Gamma_{e_2}) \cap T_{v_1}\mathcal{I}_{v_1}(\Gamma_{v_1})) = \text{Span}(u_1),$$

which gives us the orientation $+u_1$. Thus the capping orientation of $\Gamma_{B'}$ is given by $(-1)^{\tilde{\sigma}}u_1$, where

$$\tilde{\sigma} = 0 + 1 + 1 + 1 \cdot (2 + 2 + 2 + 1 + 1) + (2 + 1) \cdot 0 + 0 = 0.$$

The cusp-subspace is given by $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_{B'}) = \text{Span}(\partial_{x_1}, \partial_{x_2})$.

Now it is time for the final gluing. Recall that the capping orientation of Γ_a is given by $-\partial_{x_1}$, and that $u_1 \simeq \partial_{x_2}$ in the chosen trivialization. Thus the orientation of $T_p\mathcal{I}_p(\Gamma_{B'}) \oplus T_p\mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_a)$ is given by

$$\partial_{x_2} \wedge (-\partial_{x_1}) = \partial_{x_1} \wedge \partial_{x_2},$$

so $\nu_1 = 0$, following the notation in Definition 3.22. Moreover, $\beta(s, \Theta_\Gamma) = 1+1+1+1 = 0$ since we have four α -rotations. To calculate μ , we use Figure 16 together with Definition 2.16, from which it follows that $\mu = 0$. We also have that $j = 2$.

It follows that the capping orientation of Γ_B is given by $(-1)^\sigma$, where

$$\sigma = 0 + (2 + 2) \cdot (1 + 1) + (2 + 1) \cdot (1 + 1 + 2) + 2 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot (4 + 1) + 2 + 1 + 0 + 0 = 1.$$

Thus we get that the sign of Γ_B is given by $\sigma_s(\Gamma_B) = -1$.

5. ORIENTATION OF PSEUDO-HOLOMORPHIC DISKS

Here we review some background materials concerning orientations of pseudo-holomorphic disks. We follow [EES05b], except that we will choose slightly different orientation conventions.

In Section 5.1 we give a definition of pseudo-holomorphic disks with boundary on Λ , and also discuss Sobolev spaces associated to the linearization of the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator at such a disk. In Subsection 5.2 we fix some orientation conventions, and also discuss stabilization of Fredholm operators. This is related to Section 5.3, where we describe some exact sequences of finite-dimensional vector spaces, which occurs when we glue pseudo-holomorphic disks together at punctures. We then have the materials needed to define the capping orientation of a pseudo-holomorphic disk, which is done in Section 5.4.

5.1. J -holomorphic disks. In this section we describe J -holomorphic disks with boundary on Λ . Then we discuss the Lagrangian boundary conditions that these disks induce, and define the linearization of the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator at such a disk. In particular, we specify certain weighted Sobolev spaces that will make this operator Fredholm. We start by describing the almost complex structure J .

5.1.A. Complex structure. In [Ekh07] it is proven that after a generic perturbation of Λ and a C^1 -change of metric on M , there is a neighborhood of the rigid trees of Λ where the metric is flat. Moreover, the almost complex structure on T^*M induced by this metric can in local coordinates $\mathbb{C}^n \simeq T^*M$ be identified with i .

Hereafter, we will let J denote such an almost complex structure.

5.1.B. Punctured J -holomorphic disks and Lagrangian boundary conditions. Let $\Lambda \subset J^1(M)$ be a Legendrian submanifold, and let J be an almost complex structure on T^*M as described in Section 5.1.A. Let D_{m+1} be the unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$ with $m+1$ distinct punctures $q_0, q_1, \dots, q_m$ on ∂D_{m+1} , where $q_0 = 1$ and where the punctures are ordered counterclockwise. Let I_j , $j = 0, \dots, m$, be the part of ∂D_{m+1} going from p_j to p_{j+1} ($m+1 = 0$). We think of the disk as having half-infinite strips

$$E_{p_j} = \{(\tau, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, 1]\}, \quad (\tau, t) = \tau + it,$$

attached at each puncture p_j , and assume that the coordinates are chosen so that $\tau + 0i$ belongs to I_{j-1} and $\tau + i$ belongs to I_j .

Let $a, b_1, \dots, b_m$ be Reeb chords of Λ , or equivalently, double points of $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$. Let $c^\pm$ denote the end points of c , $c = a, b_1, \dots, b_m$, where c is regarded as a Reeb chord. Here c^+ represents the point with the largest z -coordinate.

Definition 5.1. A J -holomorphic disk of Λ with positive puncture a and negative punctures $b_1, \dots, b_m$ is given by a map $u : D_{m+1} \rightarrow T^*M$ such that

- $\bar{\partial}_J u := du + J \circ du \circ i = 0$,
- $u|_{\partial D_{m+1}}$ admits a continuous lift $\tilde{u} : \partial D_{m+1} \rightarrow \Lambda \subset J^1(M)$,
- $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow p_0} u(\zeta) = a$, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{u}(\tau + 0) = a^-$, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{u}(\tau + i) = a^+$ in E_{p_0} ,
- $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow p_j} u(\zeta) = b_j$, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{u}(\tau + 0) = b_j^+$, $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{u}(\tau + i) = b_j^-$ in E_{p_j} .

Associated to each J -holomorphic disk u of Λ , there is a linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator. See Section 5.1.D, and for example [MS12] for an introduction to the theory. Let $\mathcal{M}(a, \mathbf{b})$, $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$, denote the moduli space of J -holomorphic disks of Λ with positive puncture a and negative punctures $b_1, \dots, b_m$. These spaces are said to be *transversely cut out* if 0 is a regular value of the corresponding linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operators. We say that $u \in \mathcal{M}(a, \mathbf{b})$ is *rigid* if $\mathcal{M}(a, \mathbf{b})$ is a transversely cut out manifold of dimension 0.

Any J -holomorphic disk (and Morse flow tree) of Λ will induce a Lagrangian boundary condition for the corresponding linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator. We fix some notation.

Definition 5.2. A *Lagrangian boundary condition* on ∂D_{m+1} is a family of maps

$$\Theta = (\Theta_0, \Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_m), \quad \Theta_j : I_j \rightarrow \text{Lag}(n)$$

where $\text{Lag}(n)$ is the space of Lagrangian subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Definition 5.3. A *trivialized Lagrangian boundary condition* for the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator on D_{m+1} is a collection of maps

$$A = \{A_0, \dots, A_m\}, \quad A_j : I_j \rightarrow U(n).$$

Remark 5.4. A trivialized Lagrangian boundary condition induces a Lagrangian boundary condition Θ by $\Theta_i = A_i \mathbb{R}^n \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. Also, given a Lagrangian boundary condition on the punctured disk we can always find a trivialization for it. This need not be the case for the non-punctured disk.

If u is a J -holomorphic disk with boundary on Λ , then the tangent planes of the Lagrangian projection of Λ along the boundary of u give a Lagrangian boundary condition defined on D_{m+1} . This induces a trivialized boundary condition A_u , after some choices of trivializations. Similarly, the Lagrangian projection of the 1-jet lift of a Morse flow tree Γ gives also a Lagrangian boundary condition, which induces a trivialized boundary condition on $\Delta(\Gamma)$ after some choices.

Remark 5.5. Recall that we have a canonical identification of standard domains Δ_{m+1} and punctured unit disks $D_{m+1} \subset \mathbb{C}$, given by the Riemann mapping theorem. We will use the notation Δ_{m+1} and D_{m+1} interchangeably.

Remark 5.6. Since we will use the fiber scaling $s_\lambda : (x, y, z) \mapsto (x, \lambda y, \lambda z)$ which pushes Λ down to the zero section in $J^1(M)$, and in this way find sequences of disks converging to trees, we will have a λ -dependence on Λ . This we often suppress from the notation, but sometimes we indicate it by writing $\Lambda_\lambda = s_\lambda(\Lambda)$. Thus, one should keep in mind that when we say that u is a J -holomorphic disk of Λ , we mean that u is a J -holomorphic disk of Λ_λ for some $\lambda > 0$.

5.1.C. *Boundary conditions close to a puncture.* Let q be a puncture of a J -holomorphic disk u of Λ . After certain deformations of Λ and the metric g on M , as described in [Ekh07], we can find coordinates of T^*M so that the boundary conditions induced by u are given by

$$v(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ v(\tau + i) \in \underbrace{e^{-i\theta_\lambda} \mathbb{R} \times \dots \times e^{-i\theta_\lambda} \mathbb{R}}_k \times \underbrace{e^{i\theta_\lambda} \mathbb{R} \times \dots \times e^{i\theta_\lambda} \mathbb{R}}_{n-k}$$

in a neighborhood of q . Here $\theta_\lambda \in (0, \pi/2)$ and $\theta_\lambda \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. If q is a positive (negative) puncture then the first k directions correspond to $T_q W^u(q)$ ($T_q W^s(q)$) and the last $n - k$ directions to $T_q W^s(q)$ ($T_q W^u(q)$).

5.1.D. *Weighted Sobolev spaces and Fredholm operators.* Let $u : D_{m+1} \rightarrow T^*M$ be a J -holomorphic disk with boundary on Λ . We will associate weighted Sobolev spaces $\mathcal{H}_{k,\mu}[u]$ to u , $k = 1, 2$, and also a $\bar{\partial}$ -operator $\bar{\partial}_u$ defined between these spaces. This $\bar{\partial}$ -operator should be thought of as the linearization of $\bar{\partial}$ at u .

Let $\mathcal{H}_k(D_{m+1}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ be the closure of $C_0^\infty(D_{m+1}, \mathbb{C}^n)$, with norm $\|f\|_k$ given by the standard Sobolev $\mathcal{H}_k$ -norm. We will weight these spaces, as follows.

For each puncture $q_i \in D_{m+1}$ we define a *weight vector*

$$\mu_i = (\mu_i^1, \dots, \mu_i^n) \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)^n$$

and let $\mu = (\mu_0, \dots, \mu_m)$. A *weight function* $\mathbf{w}_\mu$ associated to μ is a continuous function $\mathbf{w}_\mu : \Delta_{m+1} \rightarrow GL(n)$ satisfying

$$\mathbf{w}_\mu(\tau, t) = \text{Diag}(e^{\mu_i^1|\tau|}, \dots, e^{\mu_i^n|\tau|})$$

in $E_i(M)$. We assume that $\mathbf{w}_\mu$ is close to the identity matrix in compact regions of the disk.

Let the *weighted Sobolev space* $\mathcal{H}_{k,\mu}(D_{m+1}, \mathbb{C}^n)$ be defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_{k,\mu}(D_{m+1}, \mathbb{C}^n) = \{f \in \mathcal{H}_k^{\text{loc}}(D_{m+1}, \mathbb{C}^n); \mathbf{w}_\mu f \in \mathcal{H}_k(D_{m+1}, \mathbb{C}^n)\}$$

with norm

$$\|f\|_{k,\mu} = \|\mathbf{w}_\mu f\|_k.$$

Now assume that u is a J -holomorphic disk of Λ , fix a trivialization A of $T\Lambda$ along the boundary of u . Let

$$\mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[u] = \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[u](D_{m+1}, u^*TT^*M)$$

denote the closed subspace of $\mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}(D_{m+1}, u^*TT^*M)$, consisting of elements s that are tangent to $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$ along ∂D_{m+1} , and which satisfies $\bar{\partial}s|_{\partial D_{m+1}} = 0$. Similarly, let

$$\mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0] = \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0](D_{m+1}, T^{*0,1}D_{m+1} \otimes u^*TT^*M)$$

be the closed subspace of $\mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}(D_{m+1}, T^{*0,1}D_{m+1} \otimes u^*TT^*M)$ consisting of elements s satisfying $s|_{\partial D_{m+1}} = 0$.

We define the *linearized weighted $\bar{\partial}$ -operator at u* to be the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}_{u,\mu} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[u] &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0], \\ \bar{\partial}_{u,\mu}(v) &= dv + J \circ dv \circ i. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.7. We write $\bar{\partial}_{A,\mu} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[A] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0]$ if we want to indicate the chosen trivialization A .

Recall that a *Fredholm operator* L between linear spaces V, W is a bounded linear operator $L : V \rightarrow W$ satisfying that the kernel and cokernel of L are finite-dimensional and that the image of L is closed. The *index* of L is given by

$$\text{index } L = \dim \text{Ker } L - \dim \text{Coker } L$$

and the *determinant line* of L is given by

$$\det L = \bigwedge^{\max} \text{Ker } L \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} (\text{Coker } L)^*.$$

The set $F(X, Y)$ of all Fredholm operators is open in the space $L(V, W)$ of bounded linear operators from V to W , and the collection of all determinant lines gives rise to a line bundle over $F(X, Y)$, see e.g. [Qui85].

In [EES05a] it is proven that, with a suitable choice of Sobolev spaces, the linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator at a punctured J -holomorphic disk with boundary on $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$ is a Fredholm operator.

Definition 5.8. The pair (A, μ) is called *admissible* if $\bar{\partial}_{A, \mu}$ is Fredholm.

An orientation of u is given by an orientation of the determinant line of $\bar{\partial}_{u, \mu}$.

5.2. Orientation conventions. It is necessary to fix some orientation conventions to be able to speak of canonical isomorphisms of oriented spaces. In Subsection 5.2.A we discuss the orientation of finite dimensional vector spaces induced by exact sequences. In Subsection 5.2.B we deal with stabilizations of Fredholm operators, and in the last two subsections we apply this to the linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator, and also fix an orientation of the space of conformal variations of the punctured disk.

5.2.A. Linear algebra. Let V be a finite-dimensional vector space, and let

$$v_{\bar{n}} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$$

be an oriented basis for V . We then represent the orientation ϕ_V of V by the wedge product $v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_n \in \Lambda^{\max} V$. Clearly $v_{\bar{n}}$ and $w_{\bar{n}}$ gives the same orientation of V if and only if $v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_n = \alpha w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_n$ for some $\alpha \in (0, \infty)$. The oriented basis $v_{\bar{n}}$ of V also induces an orientation of V^* via the wedge $v_1^* \wedge \dots \wedge v_n^*$. Here v_i^* is the dual vector of v_i .

If V and W are oriented vector spaces then the orientations ϕ_V and ϕ_W , represented by $\phi_V \in \Lambda^{\max} V$ and $\phi_W \in \Lambda^{\max} W$, respectively, canonically induce an orientation of the 1-dimensional space $\Lambda^{\max} V \otimes \Lambda^{\max}(W^*)$ via the pair $(\phi_V, \phi_W) \in \Lambda^{\max} V \times \Lambda^{\max} W$. Two pairs (ϕ_V, ϕ_W) and (ϕ'_V, ϕ'_W) are equivalent if and only if $\phi_V = \alpha \phi'_V$, $\phi_W = \beta \phi'_W$, $\alpha\beta > 0$. We call an equivalence class (ϕ_V, ϕ_W) an *orientation pair* of $\Lambda^{\max} V \otimes \Lambda^{\max} W$.

We will often consider exact sequences involving at most four non-trivial finite-dimensional vector spaces, as follows

$$(5.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow V_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} W_1 \xrightarrow{\beta} W_2 \xrightarrow{\gamma} V_2 \rightarrow 0.$$

A basic observations when working with orientations in SFT is that, after having fixed orientations of three of the spaces in the sequence above, the fourth one can be given an induced orientation. This induced orientation is canonical, up to choices of orientation conventions. We fix these conventions in what follows. Also compare with the discussion in [Zin13].

Pick a basis $(v_1, \dots, v_k)$ for V_1 and vectors $(u_1, \dots, u_l) \in W_2$ so that $(\gamma(u_1), \dots, \gamma(u_l))$ gives a basis for V_2 . Then pick vectors $(w_1, \dots, w_m) \in W_1$ so that a basis for W_1 is given by $(\alpha(v_1), \dots, \alpha(v_k), w_1, \dots, w_m)$. By exactness of the sequence (5.1) we then get that $(\beta(w_1), \dots, \beta(w_m), u_1, \dots, u_l)$ gives a basis for W_2 . Now consider the map

$$(5.2) \quad \Phi : \bigwedge^{\max} V_1 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} V_2 \rightarrow \bigwedge^{\max} W_1 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} W_2$$

given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k \otimes \gamma(u_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \gamma(u_l)) \\ = v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_k \wedge w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_m \otimes u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_l \wedge \beta(w_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \beta(w_m). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.9. *The sequence (5.1) together with the map (5.2) induces an isomorphism*

$$(5.3) \quad \phi : \bigwedge^{\max} V_1 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} V_2 \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigwedge^{\max} W_1 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} W_2,$$

and hence a one-to-one correspondence between orientation pairs of (V_1, V_2) and of (W_1, W_2) .

Proof. It is a standard fact, see e.g. [FH93], that we have an isomorphism between $\bigwedge^{\max} V_1 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} V_2^*$ and $\bigwedge^{\max} W_1 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} W_2^*$, and hence also between $\bigwedge^{\max} V_1 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} V_2$ and $\bigwedge^{\max} W_1 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} W_2$. See [Zin13] for the proof of the fact that our chosen isomorphism is well-defined on the level of orientation pairs. $\square$

From now on, unless something else is explicitly stated, when we say that a space is given an orientation induced by an exact sequence, it is understood that we mean the orientation induced by the conventions in Lemma 5.9.

Remark 5.10. In [EES05b] the following, slightly different, convention is used instead of (5.2):

$$(5.4) \quad \tilde{\Phi} : \bigwedge^{\max} V_1 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} V_2 \rightarrow \bigwedge^{\max} W_1 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} W_2$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}(v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_k \otimes \gamma(u_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge \gamma(u_l)) = \\ v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_k \wedge w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_m \otimes \beta(w_m) \wedge \cdots \wedge \beta(w_1) \wedge u_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge u_l. \end{aligned}$$

5.2.B. *Stabilization and exact gluing sequences.* In this section we discuss stabilization of Fredholm operators, and its affect on orientations.

In applications we will often have exact sequences of the form

$$(5.5) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } D_0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } D_1 \\ \text{Ker } D_2 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } D_1 \\ \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Coker } D_2 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{Coker } D_0 \rightarrow 0$$

where $D_i : V_i \rightarrow W_i$, $i = 0, 1, 2$, are Fredholm operators, and where we have inclusions $V_i \subset V_0$, $W_i \subset W_0$, $i = 1, 2$. Using the isomorphism (5.2) we see that this sequence induces an orientation on $\det D_0$, given that we have fixed orientations of $\det D_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and also on $\mathbb{R}^n$. We need to understand how this induced orientation changes if we are considering stabilized problems.

We first describe a way to stabilize a Fredholm problem to make it surjective. To that end, let $D : V \rightarrow W$ be a Fredholm operator, and let $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow W$ be a linear operator so that

$$\begin{aligned} D_\Psi : V \oplus \mathbb{R}^N &\rightarrow W, \\ D_\Psi(h, k) &= D(h) + \Psi(k) \end{aligned}$$

is surjective. Here $N \geq 0$ is some sufficiently large integer, see e.g. [FH93]. In this way we get an induced exact sequence

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & \text{Ker } D & \rightarrow & \text{Ker } D_\Psi & \rightarrow & \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow \text{Coker } D \rightarrow 0 \\ & & h & \mapsto & (h, 0) & & \\ & & & & (h, k) & \mapsto & k \\ & & & & & & k \mapsto \text{Proj}_{\text{Coker } D} \circ \Psi(k). \end{array}$$

By Lemma 5.9, if we fix an orientation on $\det D$ and on $\mathbb{R}^N$, then this sequence induces an orientation on $\text{Ker } D_\Psi$. We will call this orientation *the stabilized orientation of D_Ψ* .

To describe this orientation explicitly, assume that we have chosen orientations of $\text{Ker } D$ and $\text{Coker } D$, respectively, so that the orientation of $\bigwedge^{\max} \text{Ker } D \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} \text{Coker } D$ represents the fixed orientation of $\det D$. Let $V_{ck} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a subspace so that

$$\text{Proj}_{\text{Coker } D} \circ \Psi|_{V_{ck}} : V_{ck} \rightarrow \text{Coker } D$$

is an isomorphism. Choose an orientation of V_{ck} so that this isomorphism in addition is orientation preserving. With abuse of notation we will often replace V_{ck} by $\text{Coker } D$. Let $\mathcal{E}_R \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ so that

$$(5.7) \quad \mathbb{R}^N = \text{Coker } D \oplus \mathcal{E}_R$$

oriented. Then the stabilized orientation of $\text{Ker}(D_\Psi)$ is given by

$$(5.8) \quad \text{Ker}(D_\Psi) \simeq \text{Ker } D \oplus \mathcal{E}_R.$$

Remark 5.11. If we instead use the convention (5.4), then the identification 5.7 induces the orientation

$$\text{Ker}(D_\Psi) \simeq (-1)^{\dim \text{Coker } D(\dim \text{Coker } D + N) + \iota_{\mathcal{E}_R}} \text{Ker } D \oplus \mathcal{E}_R.$$

Now consider the situation when we have three Fredholm operators $D_i : V_i \rightarrow W_i$, $i = 0, 1, 2$, together with inclusions $V_i \subset V_0$, $W_i \subset W_0$, $i = 1, 2$, and an exact sequence of the form (5.5). Fix an orientation of $\det D_i$ by choosing orientations of $\text{Ker } D_i$ and $\text{Coker } D_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Also pick an orientation of $\mathbb{R}^n$. We are interested in the orientation induced on $\det D_0$ from these choices, via the sequence (5.5) and the isomorphism (5.2), both before and after having stabilized the involved operators. To compute this, we fix an orientation on $\text{Ker } D_0$, and let the orientation on $\text{Coker } D_0$ vary.

We start by computing the non-stabilized orientation. We will assume that we have splittings given by (up to isomorphisms)

$$(5.9) \quad \text{Ker } D_i \simeq \text{Ker } D_0 \oplus C_i \quad i = 1, 2$$

$$(5.10) \quad \mathbb{R}^n \simeq \text{Ker } D_0 \oplus C_1 \oplus C_2 \oplus C$$

$$(5.11) \quad \text{Coker } D_0 \simeq \text{Coker } D_1 \oplus C \oplus \text{Coker } D_2$$

and where the isomorphisms are induced by the maps in the sequence (5.5). Give the spaces C_i , $i = 1, 2$, the orientations induced from equation (5.9), and let C be given the orientation from equation (5.10).

Lemma 5.12. *The orientation of $\det D_0$ induced by the exact sequence (5.5) together with the isomorphism (5.2) is given by*

$$(5.12) \quad (-1)^{\sigma_2} \bigwedge^{\max} \text{Ker } D_0 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} \text{Coker } D_1 \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} C \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} \text{Coker } D_2,$$

where

$$\sigma_2 = \dim C_1 + (C + \dim \text{Coker } D_2)(n - \dim C) + \dim \text{Ker } D_0 \dim C_1.$$

Proof. Consider the sequence (5.5). Fix orientations of the spaces in the first, second, and fourth column, and let the third column get the orientation induced by the isomorphism (5.2). If we use the splittings given by (5.9), (5.10) and (5.11), then this sequence reads

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } D_0 \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{Ker } D_0 \\ C_1 \\ \text{Ker } D_0 \\ C_2 \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{Coker } D_1 \\ C \\ \text{Coker } D_2 \\ -C_1 \\ \text{Ker } D_0 \\ C_2 \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{Coker } D_1 \\ C \\ \text{Coker } D_2 \end{array} \right] \rightarrow 0$$

where $-C_1$ denotes the image of C_1 under the map $-\text{id}$. (That is, $-C_1$ equals C_1 as non-oriented vector space, but is given the orientation $o_{(-C_1)} = (-1)^{\dim C_1} o_{C_1}$.)

Now recall that we have fixed an orientation on $\mathbb{R}^n$, rather than on $\text{Coker } D_0$, and that the spaces in the third column are supposed to be ordered as $\text{Coker } D_1 \oplus \mathbb{R}^n \oplus \text{Coker } D_2$. This implies that the sequence (5.5) induces the orientation

$$(-1)^{\sigma_2} \text{Coker } D_1 \oplus C \oplus \text{Coker } D_2$$

on $\text{Coker } D_0$. The result follows. $\square$

Now we investigate the orientation induced on D_0 from the sequence (5.5) after having stabilized the operators.

So assume that we have defined stabilizations

$$\Psi_i : \mathbb{R}^{N_i} \rightarrow W_i, \quad i = 0, 1, 2,$$

so that

$$(5.13) \quad D_{\Psi_i} : V_i \oplus \mathbb{R}^{N_i} \rightarrow W_i, \quad D_{\Psi_i}(h, k) = D_i(h) + \Psi_i(k), \quad i = 0, 1, 2,$$

are surjective. Also assume that we have chosen the spaces $\mathbb{R}^{N_i}$, $i = 1, 2$, in such a way so that

$$\mathcal{E}_R^1 \simeq C_2 \oplus C,$$

$$\mathcal{E}_R^2 \simeq C_1 \oplus C,$$

oriented, where we as before assume that

$$\mathbb{R}^{N_i} \simeq \text{Coker } D_i \oplus \mathcal{E}_R^i, \quad i = 1, 2, \text{ oriented.}$$

This implies that the stabilized orientation of D_{Ψ_i} , $i = 1, 2$, is given by

$$(5.14) \quad \text{Ker}(D_{\Psi_1}) = \text{Ker } D_0 \oplus C_1 \oplus C_2 \oplus C$$

$$(5.15) \quad \text{Ker}(D_{\Psi_2}) = \text{Ker } D_0 \oplus C_2 \oplus C_1 \oplus C.$$

Let us in addition assume that $\mathbb{R}^N = \mathbb{R}^{N_1} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{N_2}$, so that we have oriented identifications

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}^N &\simeq \text{Coker } D_1 \oplus C_2 \oplus C \oplus \text{Coker } D_2 \oplus C_1 \oplus C \\ &= (-1)^\sigma \text{Coker } D_1 \oplus C \oplus \text{Coker } D_2 \oplus C_2 \oplus C_1 \oplus C \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\sigma = \dim C_2(\dim C + \dim \text{Coker } D_2).$$

Then, if we assume that the orientation of $\det D_0$ is given by the equation (5.12), we get that the stabilized orientation of $\text{Ker } D_{\Psi_0}$ is given by

$$\text{Ker}(D_{\Psi_0}) = (-1)^\sigma \text{Ker } D_0 \oplus C_2 \oplus C_1 \oplus C.$$

Lemma 5.13. *We have*

$$\sigma + \sigma_2 \equiv \dim \text{Ker } D_1(n + \text{index } D_2) \pmod{2}.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma + \sigma_2 &\equiv \dim C_1 + (C + \dim \text{Coker } D_2)(n - \dim C) + \dim \text{Ker } D \dim C_1 \\ &\quad + \dim C_2(\dim C + \dim \text{Coker } D_2) \\ &\equiv \dim \text{Ker } D_1(n + \dim C_2 + \dim \text{Ker } D + \dim \text{Coker } D_2) \\ &\equiv \dim \text{Ker } D_1(n + \text{index } D_2) \pmod{2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we compare the stabilized orientation of $\text{Ker } D_{\Psi_0}$ with the one induced by the stabilization of the gluing sequence (5.5), which reads

$$(5.16) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } D_{\Psi_0} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } D_{\Psi_1} \\ \text{Ker } D_{\Psi_2} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0.$$

Lemma 5.14. *The stabilized orientation of $\text{Ker } D_{\Psi_0}$ equals the orientation induced by the sequence (5.16) via the isomorphism (5.2).*

Proof. If we use the orientated splittings (5.14), (5.15) and (5.10), we see that the sequence (5.16) reads

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } D_{\Psi_0} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \text{Ker } D_0 \\ C_1 \\ C_2 \\ C \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} \text{Ker } D_0 \\ C_2 \\ C_1 \\ C \end{pmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } D_0 \\ C_1 \\ C_2 \\ C \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0,$$

which induces the orientation

$$\text{Ker } D_{\Psi_0} = (-1)^{\dim C_1 \cdot \dim C_2} \text{Ker } D_0 \oplus C_1 \oplus C_2 \oplus C = \text{Ker } D_0 \oplus C_2 \oplus C_1 \oplus C.$$

□

5.2.C. *The fully linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator.* Let $u : D_{m+1} \rightarrow T^*M$ be a J -holomorphic disk of L , and let κ denote the conformal structure of D_{m+1} . Recall the associated linearized operator $\bar{\partial}_u : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[u] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0]$ introduced in Section 5.1.D. When considering the orientation of u , we will need to take into account the input coming from the space $T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ of conformal variations at κ . Thus, we need to study the *fully linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator* $D\bar{\partial}_{u,\kappa}$ at (u, κ) , given by

$$(5.17) \quad D\bar{\partial}_{u,\kappa} = \bar{\partial}_u \oplus \Psi_\kappa : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[u] \oplus T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0],$$

where $\Psi_\kappa : T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0]$ is a linear map. For a more explicit description of Ψ_κ , see Section 7.1. For the moment it suffices to know that $D\bar{\partial}_{u,\kappa}$ is surjective with the same kernel as $\bar{\partial}_u$, and that we have an exact sequence

$$(5.18) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_u & \rightarrow & \text{Ker}(\bar{\partial}_u \oplus \Psi_\kappa) & \rightarrow & T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_u \rightarrow 0 \\ & & v & \mapsto & \begin{pmatrix} v \\ v, w \end{pmatrix} & \mapsto & \begin{pmatrix} w \\ w \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \overline{\Psi(w)} \end{array}$$

where $\overline{\Psi(w)}$ denotes the projection of $\Psi_\kappa(w)$ to the cokernel. In particular, we have isomorphisms

$$(5.19) \quad T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1} \simeq D\bar{\partial}_{u,\kappa}(T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}) \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_u.$$

Using Lemma 5.9 we get an isomorphism

$$\bigwedge^{\max} \text{Ker } D\bar{\partial}_{u,\kappa} \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} (\text{Coker } D\bar{\partial}_{u,\kappa})^* \simeq \bigwedge^{\max} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_u \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} (\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_u)^* \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}.$$

Thus, we see that an orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_u$ together with an orientation of $T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ induces an orientation of $\det D\bar{\partial}_{u,\kappa}$. In particular, if $D\bar{\partial}_{u,\kappa}$ is an isomorphism, then the orientation is given by a sign coming from comparing the orientation of $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_u$ with the orientation of $T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ under the isomorphism in (5.19). This will be the case for rigid J -holomorphic disks.

In the next subsection we fix an orientation of the space of conformal structures, and we refer to Section 5.4 for the definition of the orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_u$ (which will be the capping orientation of u).

Remark 5.15. If $m = 1$, then $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ is empty and we have $D\bar{\partial}_{u,\kappa} = \bar{\partial}_u$. The tangent space of the moduli space of rigid J -holomorphic disks at u can then be identified with $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_u / T\mathcal{T}_2$, where $\mathcal{T}_2$ is the space of conformal automorphisms of D_2 . Here we embed $T\mathcal{T}_2 \subset \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_u$ via $v \mapsto dw \cdot v$, $v \in T\mathcal{T}_2$. If u is rigid, then we have $\dim T\mathcal{T}_2 = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_u$, and thus to get the sign of u we should compare the orientation of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_u$ with the orientation of $T\mathcal{T}_2$, via the identification just described. We orient $\mathcal{T}_2$ as follows. Consider D_2 as the unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$ with a positive puncture at 1 and a negative puncture at -1 . The tangent space of $\mathcal{T}_2$ at the identity is 1-dimensional, spanned by

holomorphic vector fields vanishing at 1 and -1 , and which are tangent to the boundary along the boundary. Evaluation of such a vector field at i gives an isomorphism $T_{\text{id}}\mathcal{T}_2 \rightarrow T_i D_2$. We use this map to orient $T_{\text{id}}\mathcal{T}_2$, recalling that ∂D_2 is oriented counterclockwise. We then use the group structure of $\mathcal{T}_2$ to orient the whole space.

5.2.D. *Orientation of the space of conformal variations.* In this subsection we will fix an orientation of the space $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ of conformal structures on the $m+1$ -punctured unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$. We will also carry it over to the setting of Section 2.4 where we viewed conformal structures as represented by standard domains.

First consider the case when we view the domain of the punctured J -holomorphic disk as the unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$, with $m+1$ punctures $p_0, \dots, p_m$. We assume that the positive puncture p_0 is located at $z = 1$. If we fix the first two negative punctures p_1, p_2 at $z = i$ and $z = -1$, respectively, then the position of the remaining punctures $p_3, \dots, p_m$ uniquely determines the conformal structure κ of the disk. Let v_i be the vector field supported in a neighborhood of p_i which agrees with the vector field $z \mapsto iz$ near the puncture (making the puncture moving counter-clockwise along the boundary), and which is tangent to the boundary along the boundary. See Figure 17. We then get a canonical identification of the tangent space $T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ of $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ at κ with the tuple of vector fields $(v_3, \dots, v_m)$. We define the positive orientation of $T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ to be the orientation induced by the ordered tuple $(v_3, \dots, v_m)$. If $m = 2$ we let the one point space $\mathcal{C}_3$ be positively oriented.




FIGURE 17. To the left a punctured disk with the conformal variations v_3, v_4 indicated. To the right a standard domain with the conformal variations t_1, t_2, t_3 indicated.

We would like to translate this into the case when we view the disk D_{m+1} as a standard domain Δ_{m+1} . Recall that in this setting a conformal structure κ is given by the location of $m-2$ out of $m-1$ slits, and that two standard domains are conformally equivalent if and only if their boundary minima differs by an overall translation.

Let t_j be the conformal variation that corresponds to moving the j th boundary minimum towards $-\infty$, and which is cut-off in a neighborhood of this boundary minimum. See Figure 17. The tangent space $T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ is then spanned by $m-2$ of the $m-1$ tangent vectors t_j . We have the following.

Lemma 5.16 (Lemma 6.4, [EENS13]). *The orientation of $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ given by $t_2 \wedge \dots \wedge t_{m-1}$ agrees with the orientation of $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ defined above.*

It will also be necessary to sometimes consider the orientation of $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ as given by the vectors $t_1, \dots, \hat{t}_j, \dots, t_{m-1}$. Here $\hat{v}$ means that the vector v is absent. We have the following.

Lemma 5.17. *On the level of orientations of $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge t_{j-1} \wedge \hat{t}_j \wedge t_{j+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge t_{m-1} &= -t_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge t_{j-1} \wedge t_j \wedge \hat{t}_{j+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge t_{m-1} \\ &= -t_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{t}_{j-1} \wedge t_j \wedge t_{j+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge t_{m-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $j \neq 1$ this follows from [[EENS13], Lemma 6.4]. If $j = 1$ we get $t_1 = \sum_{j=2}^{m-1} v_j$ and $t_2 = -v_2 + \sum_{j=3}^{m-1} v_j$. $\square$

Corollary 5.18. *On the level of orientations we have*

$$t_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge t_{j-1} \wedge \hat{t}_j \wedge t_{j+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge t_{m-1} = (-1)^{j-1} t_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge t_{m-1}.$$

In particular

$$t_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge t_{m-2} = (-1)^{m-2} t_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge t_{m-1}.$$

5.3. Gluing of trivialized boundary conditions. One of the most important tools in this paper is exact sequences of kernels and cokernels of $\bar{\partial}$ -operators. These sequences occur when we glue J -holomorphic disks together at punctures.

In [[EES05b], Section 3.2] these kind of sequences are described in detail, and proven to be exact. Since we will use these sequences repeatedly, we give an outline of the constructions found in that paper and also re-state the results that we will need.

We mention that these sequences are needed in the inductive procedure of proving that the sign $\sigma(\Gamma)$, defined in Section 3, satisfies the statements in Theorem 1.1. They are also used when we define the capping orientation of a J -holomorphic disk.

5.3.A. Gluing weighted disks. Let Δ_A and Δ_B be two standard domains with corresponding trivialized Lagrangian boundary conditions $A : \partial\Delta_A \rightarrow U(n)$ and $B : \partial\Delta_B \rightarrow U(n)$, respectively. Let E_0 be the strip-like end of Δ_A at $\tau = -\infty$, and let E be one of the strip-like ends of Δ_B at $\tau = +\infty$. Pick coordinates $(\tau, t) \in (-\infty, 0] \times [0, 1]$ on E_0 and $(\tau, t) \in [0, \infty) \times [0, 1]$ on E . Assume that A is constantly equal to the identity for $|\tau|$ large in E_0 , and that B is constantly equal to the identity for τ large in E . Then we can glue Δ_A to Δ_B , by joining E_0 and E , and get a trivialized Lagrangian boundary condition $A \# B$ on the glued domain $\Delta_A \# \Delta_B$.

Let $\nu > 0$ be so large so that A and B are constantly equal to the identity on E_0 and E for $\tau < -\nu$ and $\tau > \nu$, respectively. Let $\Delta(\rho) = \Delta_A \#_\rho \Delta_B$ be the standard domain obtained by identifying $\{-\rho\} \times [0, 1]$ on E_0 with $\{\rho\} \times [0, 1]$ on E , where $\rho \gg 2\nu$. Let $A \#_\rho B$ be the induced boundary condition, which is equal to A on the part of $\Delta(\rho)$ corresponding to Δ_A , equal to B on the part of $\Delta(\rho)$ corresponding to Δ_B , and is equal to the identity in the gluing region.

Let $\mathbf{w}_A$ and $\mathbf{w}_B$ be the weight functions associated to Δ_A and Δ_B , respectively. Let μ_A denote the weight vector at the end E_0 and let μ_B denote the weight vector at the end E , so that we have weights $\mathbf{w}_A \simeq e^{\mu_A|\tau|}$ and $\mathbf{w}_B \simeq e^{\mu_B|\tau|}$, respectively, at the actual ends. Let $\mathbf{w}_\rho$ denote the glued weight function on $\Delta(\rho)$, which equals $\mathbf{w}_A$ and $\mathbf{w}_B$,

respectively, outside the gluing region $\Delta_A \setminus (-\infty, \nu - \rho) \times [0, 1] \cup \Delta_B \setminus (-\rho - \nu, \infty) \times [0, 1]$, and is a smooth interpolation of the weight functions in the gluing region.

Assume that we have chosen weights so that $(A, \mathbf{w}_A)$ and $(B, \mathbf{w}_B)$ are both admissible pairs. Then the glued $\bar{\partial}$ -problem will also be admissible, and the index can be computed as follows. Here we assume that the weight vectors take values in $(-\pi/2, \pi/2)^n$.

Definition 5.19. If $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$ is a vector, we say that $\text{sign } \mu < 0$ ($\text{sign } \mu > 0$) if $\text{sign } \mu_i < 0$ ($\text{sign } \mu_i > 0$) for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Also, if $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$ is another vector, we say that $\text{sign } \mu = \text{sign } \nu$ ($\text{sign } \mu = -\text{sign } \nu$) if $\text{sign } \mu_i = \text{sign } \nu_i$ ($\text{sign } \mu_i = -\text{sign } \nu_i$) for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Lemma 5.20. *We have the following.*

- i) If $\text{sign } \mu_A = \text{sign } \mu_B > 0$ then $\text{index } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B} = \text{index } \bar{\partial}_A + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_B + n$.
- ii) If $\text{sign } \mu_A = \text{sign } \mu_B < 0$ then $\text{index } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B} = \text{index } \bar{\partial}_A + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_B - n$.
- iii) $\text{sign } \mu_A = -\text{sign } \mu_B$ then $\text{index } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B} = \text{index } \bar{\partial}_A + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_B$.

Proof. The second case is stated in [EES05b]. The other two cases also follow from this result, by noting that we can change all positive weights of $\mathbf{w}_A$ and $\mathbf{w}_B$ to negative weights, with the cost of raising the indices of $\bar{\partial}_A$ and $\bar{\partial}_B$ by the number of positive weights, see [EES05a]. The glued problem will have the same index as the one we get without changing the weights. Thus, in the first case we have to add n to both the index of $\bar{\partial}_A$ and $\bar{\partial}_B$, and in the second case we have to add in total n to $\text{index } \bar{\partial}_A + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_B$. $\square$

Lemma 5.21. *Assume that we are in the situation of gluing as described above. Then, for sufficiently large ρ , there are exact gluing sequences of the following form.*

- a) If $\text{sign } \mu_A = \text{sign } \mu_B > 0$ then we get

$$(5.20) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B} \xrightarrow{\alpha_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_B \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\beta_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_B \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\gamma_\rho} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B} \rightarrow 0.$$

- b) If $\text{sign } \mu_A = \text{sign } \mu_B < 0$ then we get

$$(5.21) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B} \xrightarrow{\alpha_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_B \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\beta_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_B \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\gamma_\rho} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B} \rightarrow 0.$$

- c) If $\text{sign } \mu_A = -\text{sign } \mu_B$ then we get

$$(5.22) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B} \xrightarrow{\alpha_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_B \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\beta_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_B \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\gamma_\rho} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B} \rightarrow 0.$$

In the sequences (5.20) and (5.21) we have a canonical isomorphism $\mathbb{R}^n \simeq A(-\{\rho\} \times [0, 1])$ via evaluation, and hence if we fix an orientation of $\mathbb{R}^n$ we get from each of the sequences above a canonical isomorphism between

$$\bigwedge^{\max} (\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_B) \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} (\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_A \oplus \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_B)^*$$

and

$$\bigwedge^{\max} (\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B}) \otimes \bigwedge^{\max} (\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B})^*.$$

The maps α_ρ , β_ρ and γ_ρ are given as follows. First embed the kernels and cokernels of the $\bar{\partial}_A$ and $\bar{\partial}_B$ -operators in the Sobolev spaces associated to $\bar{\partial}_{A\#B}$, by cutting off the elements with cut-off functions $\phi_A^\rho, \phi_B^\rho : \Delta(\rho) \rightarrow [0, 1]$. The cut-off functions are required to satisfy

$$(5.23) \quad \phi_A^\rho = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on } \Delta_A \setminus ((-\infty, -1/2\rho] \times [0, 1]) \\ 0 & \text{on } \Delta(\rho) \setminus (\Delta_A \setminus ((-\infty, -\rho] \times [0, 1])) \end{cases}$$

$$(5.24) \quad \phi_B^\rho = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on } \Delta_B \setminus ([1/2\rho, \infty) \times [0, 1]) \\ 0 & \text{on } \Delta(\rho) \setminus (\Delta_B \setminus ([\rho, \infty) \times [0, 1])) \end{cases}$$

and $|D^k \phi_U^\rho| = O(\rho^{-1})$, $k = 1, 2$, $U = A, B$. Also embed the constant functions defined in the gluing region representing $\mathbb{R}^n$ in a similar way, by using cut-off functions with support in the gluing region. Then α_ρ is L^2 -projection onto the space spanned by the cut-off kernel elements, β_ρ is $\bar{\partial}$ composed with L^2 -projection and γ_ρ is projection to the quotient. See [EES05b] for a more detailed description.

Proof. Follows from [[EES05b], Lemma 3.1] □

Remark 5.22. Using this lemma together with the orientation conventions from Section 5.2, we see that orientations o_A and o_B on the determinant lines of $\bar{\partial}_A$ and $\bar{\partial}_B$, respectively, canonically induces an orientation $o_{A\#B}$ on the determinant line of $\bar{\partial}_{A\#B}$.

5.3.B. *Iterated gluing sequences.* We have a similar situation concerning iterated gluings of J -holomorphic disks. And of course, we are interested in the affect of this on orientations. Again, the following is a summary of the results in [EES05b].

Let A, B and C be trivialized boundary conditions defined on standard domains Δ_A , Δ_B and Δ_C , such that A and B are gluable at a puncture p (positive for Δ_A), and such that B and C are gluable at a puncture q (positive for Δ_B), as described in the preceding subsection. Let $E = A\#B\#C$ denote the trivialized boundary condition obtained via this gluing. Fix orientations o_A, o_B and o_C on $\det \bar{\partial}_A, \det \bar{\partial}_B$ and $\det \bar{\partial}_C$, respectively. Let $o_{A\#B}$ and $o_{B\#C}$ denote the induced orientations on $\det \bar{\partial}_{A\#B}$ and $\det \bar{\partial}_{B\#C}$, respectively, via Lemma 5.21.

Let $o_{(A\#B)\#C}$ be the orientation induced on $\det \bar{\partial}_E$ by the orientations $o_{A\#B}, o_C$ and Lemma 5.21 when gluing $A\#B$ to C . Also, let $o_{A\#(B\#C)}$ be the orientation induced on $\det \bar{\partial}_E$ by the orientations $o_A, o_{B\#C}$ and Lemma 5.21 when gluing A to $B\#C$. We also let $\mu(r)_\Theta$ denote the weight vector at the puncture r of the function spaces associated to the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator with boundary conditions Θ .

Lemma 5.23 (Lemma 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 in [EES05b]). *The orientations $o_{(A\#B)\#C}$ and $o_{A\#(B\#C)}$ both coincide with the orientation $o_{A\#B\#C}$ on $\det \bar{\partial}_E$, where the latter is induced by the orientations o_A, o_B, o_C via our orientation conventions and the following sequence.*

a) If $\text{sign } \mu(p)_A = -\text{sign } \mu(p)_B$, $\text{sign } \mu(q)_B = -\text{sign } \mu(q)_C$

$$(5.25) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_E \xrightarrow{\alpha_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_B \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_C \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\beta_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_B \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_C \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\gamma_\rho} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_E \rightarrow 0.$$

b) If $\text{sign } \mu(p)_A = -\text{sign } \mu(p)_B$, $\text{sign } \mu(q)_B = \text{sign } \mu(q)_C < 0$

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_E \xrightarrow{\alpha_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_B \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_C \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\beta_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_B \\ \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_C \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\gamma_\rho} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_E \rightarrow 0$$

c) If $\text{sign } \mu(p)_A = \text{sign } \mu(p)_B < 0$, $\text{sign } \mu(q)_B = -\text{sign } \mu(q)_C$

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_E \xrightarrow{\alpha_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_B \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_C \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\beta_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_B \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_C \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\gamma_\rho} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_E \rightarrow 0.$$

d) If $\text{sign } \mu(p)_A = \text{sign } \mu(p)_B = \text{sign } \mu(q)_B = \text{sign } \mu(q)_C < 0$

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_E \xrightarrow{\alpha_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_B \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_C \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\beta_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_A \\ \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_B \\ \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_C \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\gamma_\rho} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_E \rightarrow 0.$$

The maps $\alpha_\rho, \beta_\rho, \gamma_\rho$ are defined similar to the ones in Lemma 5.21, by applying $\bar{\partial}$ and/or projecting.

Remark 5.24. We have similar results when the weights are positive, but we will not need it in this paper.

Proof. This follows from the similar result in [EES05b]. Note that we use slightly different orientation conventions, but exactly the same proof goes through. $\square$

5.4. Capping orientations of J -holomorphic disks. In this section we will define the capping orientation of a J -holomorphic disk u of Λ . We follow the similar constructions in [EES05b], except that we define slightly different capping operators.

Briefly this works as follows. Let u_b denote the restriction of u to the boundary. The choice of spin structure on Λ induces a trivialization of $u_b^* T\hat{\Lambda}$, where $\hat{\Lambda} = \Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda)$. This since we can choose a homotopy from the image of u_b to the 1-skeleton of Λ and use the trivialization defined here. The spin structure makes sure that the homotopy class of the trivialization is independent of the chosen homotopy. Closing up these paths of trivializations with something called capping trivializations, we get a trivialized Lagrangian boundary condition on the non-punctured disk. The determinant line of the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator with this boundary condition is oriented using evaluation, and if we fix orientations of the $\bar{\partial}$ -operators over the capping disks, then the sequence from Lemma

5.23 will induce an orientation of the determinant line of the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator at u . This will be the capping orientation of u .

5.4.A. *Orientation of trivialized boundary conditions on the non-punctured disk.* Let A be a trivialized Lagrangian boundary condition on the unit disk D in $\mathbb{C}$, i.e., let A be a loop $A : \partial D \rightarrow U(n)$. Let $\bar{\partial}_A$ denote the corresponding $\bar{\partial}$ -problem as defined in Section 5.1.D. The determinant lines of these type of operators give rise to a line bundle $\det \bar{\partial}$ over the space of trivialized Lagrangian boundary conditions on D , which is nothing but the space $\Omega(U(n))$ of free loops in $U(n)$. From [EES05b] and [FOOO09] we have the following result.

Proposition 5.25 ([EES05b], Lemma 3.8). *The determinant line bundle $\det \bar{\partial}$ over $\Omega(U(n))$ is orientable, and a choice of orientation of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and of $\mathbb{C}$ induces an orientation of this bundle. Moreover, the orientation is given via evaluation at a point on the boundary ∂D , where we identify the image of the evaluation with $\mathbb{R}^n$ using the given trivialization.*

Assume that we have fixed an orientation on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and on $\mathbb{C}$. We will call the orientation induced on $\det \bar{\partial}_A$ as in the lemma above the *canonical orientation*.

Remark 5.26. The orientation above depends on the chosen trivialization of the loops, see [FOOO09].

5.4.B. *Trivializations and weights associated to a punctured J -holomorphic disk.* Let u be a J -holomorphic disk of Λ , and let u_b denote the restriction of u to the boundary. Fix a spin structure $\mathfrak{s}$ on Λ . As described in Section 3.2.B, this induces a trivialized Lagrangian boundary condition $A_u : D_{m+1} \rightarrow U(n)$ of $u_b^* T\hat{\Lambda}$. We extend the trivialization A_u to a trivialization $\tilde{A}_u : D_{m+1} \rightarrow U(n+2)$ of the stabilized bundle $u_b^* T\hat{\Lambda} = u_b^* T\hat{\Lambda} \oplus \text{Aux}_1 \oplus \text{Aux}_2$, introduced in Section 3. That is, we let

$$\tilde{A}_u = \begin{bmatrix} A_u & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We call $\tilde{A}_u$ the *stabilized trivialized boundary condition of u associated to $\mathfrak{s}$* .

Note that the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem

$$\bar{\partial}_u : \mathcal{H}_2[\tilde{A}_u](D_{m+1}, u_b^* \tilde{T}\hat{\Lambda}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1[0](D_{m+1}, T^{*0,1} D_{m+1} \otimes u_b^* \tilde{T}\hat{\Lambda})$$

is not Fredholm, since the boundary conditions in the auxiliary directions are trivial. To solve this issue, we will weight the Sobolev spaces. This we do not only do in the auxiliary directions, but also in the directions corresponding to Λ , since this will be needed in the degeneration process $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

Recall the local picture in a neighborhood of a puncture $p = p_j$ of u , given in Section 5.1.C. If p is a positive (negative) puncture, then we choose coordinates at p so that the first k directions correspond to $T_p W^u(p)$ ($T_p W^s(p)$) and the last $n - k$ directions corresponds to $T_p W^s(p)$ ($T_p W^u(p)$). We choose the weight vector μ_j at p to be given

by

$$\mu_j = (\underbrace{-\delta, \dots, -\delta}_{T_p W^u(p)}, \underbrace{\delta, \dots, \delta}_{T_p W^s(p)}, \underbrace{\delta, \delta}_{\text{Aux}})$$

if p is positive, and to be given by

$$\mu_j = (\underbrace{-\delta, \dots, -\delta}_{T_p W^s(p)}, \underbrace{\delta, \dots, \delta}_{T_p W^u(p)}, \underbrace{-\delta, -\delta}_{\text{Aux}})$$

if p is negative. Here $0 < \delta < \pi$ is some fixed number. Now define a weight $\mathbf{w}_u = \mathbf{w}_\mu$ as in Section 5.1.D, using the weight vectors just described.

Lemma 5.27. *If $\lambda > 0$ is sufficiently small, then the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem*

$$\bar{\partial}_u : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\tilde{A}_u](D_{m+1}, u_b^* \tilde{T} \hat{\Lambda}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0](D_{m+1}, T^{*0,1} D_{m+1} \otimes u_b^* \tilde{T} \hat{\Lambda})$$

is Fredholm, and is split in directions corresponding to $T\Lambda$ and the auxiliary directions. Moreover, the kernel and cokernel of $\bar{\partial}_u$ equals the kernel and cokernel of the unweighted problem in the directions corresponding to $T\Lambda$. In the auxiliary directions the problem is an isomorphism.

Proof. Follows from the choice of weights, the local description of the boundary conditions close to a puncture, together with the results in [[EES05a], Section 6]. $\square$

5.4.C. *Capping operators.* To close up the trivialized Lagrangian boundary condition $\tilde{A}_u$ to give a trivialized Lagrangian boundary condition on the non-punctured disk, we use *capping operators*. These are $\bar{\partial}$ -operators defined on D_1 with certain associated trivialized boundary conditions.

Let p be a Reeb chord of Λ . We will define two *capping trivializations* at p , one for the case when we regard p as a positive puncture and one for the case when we regard p as a negative puncture. These trivializations will be split into the directions corresponding to Λ and the auxiliary directions. We start by describing the trivialization in the directions corresponding to Λ .

Recall the local description near a puncture given in Section 5.1.C. Let ∂D_1 be parametrized by $s \in [0, 1]$. Let $R_+(p), R_-(p) : \partial D_1 \rightarrow U(n)$ be the maps defined by

$$\begin{aligned} R_+(p)(s) &= \text{Diag}(\underbrace{e^{i\theta_\lambda s}, \dots, e^{i\theta_\lambda s}}_{T_p W^u(p)}, \underbrace{e^{-i\theta_\lambda s}, \dots, e^{-i\theta_\lambda s}}_{T_p W^s(p)}) \\ R_-(p)(s) &= \text{Diag}(\underbrace{e^{i\theta_\lambda s}, \dots, e^{i\theta_\lambda s}}_{T_p W^s(p)}, \underbrace{e^{-i\theta_\lambda s}, \dots, e^{-i\theta_\lambda s}}_{T_p W^u(p)}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $R_+(p) \neq R_-(p)$, and that $R_+(p) \circ R_-(p) = R_-(p) \circ R_+(p) = \text{id}$.

Extend the trivializations $R_\pm(p) : D_1 \rightarrow U(n)$ to trivializations

$$\tilde{R}_\pm(p) : D_1 \rightarrow U(n+2),$$

given as follows in the auxiliary directions.

$$\begin{array}{c|c}
 \begin{array}{l} p \text{ positive irreversible:} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{array} & \begin{array}{l} p \text{ positive reversible:} \\ \begin{bmatrix} e^{-i\pi s} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{array} \\
 \hline
 \begin{array}{l} p \text{ negative irreversible:} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{array} & \begin{array}{l} p \text{ negative reversible:} \\ \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\pi s} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

Again we need to weight the associated Sobolev spaces to get a Fredholm problem. We define a weight function $\mathbf{w}_{p,\pm} : D_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n+2}$ as follows.

$$\mathbf{w}_{p,+} = \begin{cases} e^{\delta|\tau|} & \text{in directions corresponding to } W^u(p) \\ e^{-\delta|\tau|} & \text{in directions corresponding to } W^s(p) \\ e^{-\delta|\tau|} & \text{in the auxiliary directions} \end{cases}$$

for $|\tau| > M$ in a strip-neighborhood of p for the $\tilde{R}_+$ -problem, and $\mathbf{w}_{p,+} \approx 1$ otherwise, and similarly

$$\mathbf{w}_{p,-} = \begin{cases} e^{-\delta|\tau|} & \text{in directions corresponding to } W^u(p) \\ e^{\delta|\tau|} & \text{in directions corresponding to } W^s(p) \\ e^{\delta|\tau|} & \text{in the auxiliary directions} \end{cases}$$

for $|\tau| > M$ in an strip-neighborhood of p for the $\tilde{R}_-$ -problem, and $\mathbf{w}_{p,-} \approx 1$ otherwise. Here δ is the same one as we picked when defining the weights for the problems corresponding to the J -holomorphic disks of Λ .

Let $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{p}\pm}$ denote the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator

$$\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{p}\pm} : \mathcal{H}_{2,w\pm}[\tilde{R}_{\pm}(p)](D_1, \mathbb{C}^{n+2}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,w\pm}[0](D_1, \mathbb{C}^{n+2}).$$

Definition 5.28. The operator $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{p}+}$ ($\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{p}-}$) is the *positive (negative) capping operator* at p .

Remark 5.29. A priori the capping trivializations and the induced capping operators depend on λ , and we should write $R_{\pm,\lambda}(p)$ and $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{p},\pm,\lambda}$, respectively. But this dependence is continuous, and it turns out that there is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that the kernels of the operators constitute a vector bundle over $[0, \lambda_0]$. For details, see Section 8.2.A. Below we summarize the most important results.

Remark 5.30. Let $\bar{\partial}_{p,\pm}$ denote the restriction of $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{p},\pm}$ to the directions corresponding to Λ . It follows from results in [EES05a] that the kernel (and cokernel) of the weighted $\bar{\partial}_{p,\pm}$ -problem is canonically isomorphic to the corresponding $\bar{\partial}$ -problem defined on the unweighted Sobolev spaces, if $\lambda > 0$.

Lemma 5.31. *For λ sufficiently small we have that all capping operators are surjective with the following kernel.*

p positive irreversible: $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+} \simeq T_p W^s(p) \oplus \text{Aux}_1 \oplus \text{Aux}_2$

p positive reversible: $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+} \simeq T_p W^s(p) \oplus \text{Aux}_2$

p negative irreversible: $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-} \simeq T_p W^u(p)$

p negative reversible: $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-} \simeq T_p W^u(p) \oplus \text{Aux}_1,$

where the identifications are given by evaluation at p .

Proof. Since the problem is split this follows from the similar results in [EES05a]. $\square$

Corollary 5.32. *Let p be a puncture of a J -holomorphic disk with boundary on Λ . Then*

$$\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+} \equiv n + |p| + 1, \quad \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-} \equiv |p| + 1 \pmod{2}.$$

Proof. From the definition of the grading of p we get that

$$|p| \equiv I(p) + \mu(\gamma_p) + 1 = \begin{cases} \dim W^u(p) + 1 = n + \dim W^s(p) + 1 = n + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+} + 1 & p \text{ pos, irreversible} \\ \dim W^u(p) + 1 = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-} + 1 & p \text{ neg, irreversible} \\ \dim W^u(p) = n + \dim W^s(p) = n + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+} + 1 & p \text{ pos, reversible} \\ \dim W^u(p) = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-} + 1 & p \text{ neg, reversible.} \end{cases}$$

Here all calculations are made in $\mathbb{Z}_2$. $\square$

5.4.D. *Orientations of capping operators.* We have to pick orientations of the determinant lines of the capping operators in a controlled way. To do this, we use the constructions in [EES05b]. This works as follows.

Pick an orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-}$ for each Reeb chord p . Then use Lemma 5.21 and the canonical orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}$ on the non-punctured disk to orient $\det \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+}$. More precisely, let $\bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}} = \bar{\partial}_{\bar{R}^- \# \bar{R}^+}$ denote the glued operator. By Lemma 5.21 we get the following exact sequence

$$(5.26) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-} \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-} \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Using that all cokernels are trivial, and that 2 out of 3 remaining spaces already is oriented, we get an induced orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+}$.

Now fix an orientation of $W^u(p)$ and give $W^s(p)$ the induced orientation by

$$T_p M = T_p W^u(p) \oplus T_p W^s(p).$$

This will be the *capping orientation of the stable and unstable manifold at p* .

With Lemma 5.31 in mind we define the *capping orientations of the capping operators* as follows. (Here $W^u(p)$ and $W^s(p)$ are given their capping orientation, and the auxiliary spaces are given the orientation from $\mathbb{R}$.)

Definition 5.33 (Orientation of capping operators). We give the capping operators the following orientations.

$$p \text{ positive irreversible: } \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+} = T_p W^s(p) \oplus \text{Aux}_1 \oplus \text{Aux}_2$$

$$p \text{ positive reversible: } \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+} = (-1)^{\dim W^s(p)} T_p W^s(p) \oplus \text{Aux}_2$$

$$p \text{ negative irreversible: } \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-} = T_p W^u(p)$$

$$p \text{ negative reversible: } \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-} = T_p W^u(p) \oplus \text{Aux}_1$$

See Lemma 8.6 for the analysis related to this definition.

5.4.E. *Capping operators at special punctures.* Let p be a special puncture of a partial flow tree Γ . We will define capping operators $\bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-}$ similar to the capping operators at true punctures, so that we can close up the boundary conditions for partial flow trees and give them a capping orientation. Here we describe the boundary conditions for these capping operators.

In directions corresponding to Λ . At special punctures the boundary conditions look similar to the boundary conditions at true punctures, and we define the operators $\bar{\partial}_{p,+}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{p,-}$, respectively, as the $\bar{\partial}$ -operators on D_1 with boundary conditions given similar as in Section 5.4.C. Namely, we let $\bar{\partial}_{p,+}$ have split boundary condition that rotates the lower tangent space of $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda_\lambda)$ at p to the upper tangent space, with as small rotation as possible, and so that the boundary condition converges to the identity as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Similarly we let $\bar{\partial}_{p,-}$ have the split boundary condition that rotates the upper tangent space of $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda_\lambda)$ at p to the lower, with as small rotation as possible, and so that the boundary condition converges to the identity as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

We put a small weight $e^{\delta|\tau|}$ at the puncture on D_1 in both cases, which gives that both $\bar{\partial}_{p,+}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{p,-}$ are isomorphisms if λ is sufficiently small.

In the auxiliary directions. We again need to differ between irreversible and reversible punctures, and the definition of the capping operators in the auxiliary directions are done completely analogous to the case of true punctures.

Orientations. We define the orientations of the capping operators at a special puncture p to be given by the following.

$$p \text{ positive irreversible: } \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+} = \text{Aux}_1 \oplus \text{Aux}_2$$

$$p \text{ positive reversible: } \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},+} = \text{Aux}_2$$

$$p \text{ negative irreversible: } \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-} = 1$$

$$p \text{ negative reversible: } \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p},-} = \text{Aux}_1.$$

5.4.F. *Capping orientation of a punctured J -holomorphic disk.* Now we define the orientation of the linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator at a punctured J -holomorphic disk u .

The orientation of $\bar{\partial}_u$ will be induced by the canonical orientation of the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator on the non-punctured disk, together with the capping orientations of the capping operators of the punctures of u . The capping operators are glued to u at the punctures, to obtain the *fully capped disk* $\hat{u}$ with corresponding $\bar{\partial}$ -problem

$$\bar{\partial}_{\hat{u}} : \mathcal{H}_2[\hat{A}_u](D, \mathbb{C}^{n+2}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1[0](D, \mathbb{C}^{n+2}).$$

We denote this problem the *fully capped problem corresponding to u* .

The order in which we glue the capping operators to u will be important, and we fix it as follows. Assume that the punctures of u are given by $(q_0, \dots, q_m)$, where q_0 is the positive puncture and the negative punctures are ordered in the counterclockwise direction on ∂D_{m+1} . Then we first glue the capping trivialization $\tilde{R}_+(q_0)$ to $\tilde{A}_u$ at q_0 , then $\tilde{R}_-(q_m)$ to $\tilde{A}_u$ at q_m , then $\tilde{R}_-(q_{m-1})$ to $\tilde{A}_u$ at q_{m-1} , and so on, until we get the trivialized boundary condition $\hat{A}_u$ on the closed disk.

By Lemma 5.23, these gluings induce an exact sequence

$$(5.27) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{u}} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial} \tilde{q}_{1,-} \\ \vdots \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial} \tilde{q}_{m,-} \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial} \tilde{q}_{0,+} \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_u \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial} \tilde{q}_{1,-} \\ \vdots \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial} \tilde{q}_{m,-} \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial} \tilde{q}_{0,+} \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_u \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{u}} \rightarrow 0,$$

and if we give $\det \bar{\partial}_{\hat{u}}$ the canonical orientation and fix orientations of the capping operators, we then get an induced orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_u$. Using that the stabilized problem $\bar{\partial}_u$ is split and is an isomorphism in the auxiliary directions, this in turn induces an orientation of the linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator at u in a canonical way. This is the *capping orientation of u* .

Remark 5.34. For $\lambda > 0$ we can as well use operators defined on unweighted spaces in directions corresponding to Λ , and get an sequence isomorphic to the sequence (5.27).

Definition 5.35. We will use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cap}(\Gamma_A) &= \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{q}_{i,-}} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{q}_{0,+}} \text{ oriented} \\ \text{cap}(\Gamma) &= \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{q_{i,-}} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{q_{0,+}} \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{q_{\pm}}$ is the restriction of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{q}_{\pm}}$ to the directions corresponding to Λ .

Remark 5.36. To get a well-defined orientation of u by using the method above requires that Λ is spin, it is not enough to assume that Λ is orientable. Compare [[FOOO09], Proposition 8.1.7].

Remark 5.37. The capping orientation of u depends on the chosen trivialization A_u . If we change spin structure of Λ then the capping orientation of u may change. See [[EES05b], Section 4.4], and also Section 3.2.B.

6. CAPPING ORIENTATION OF FLOW TREES

In this section we define the capping orientation of a (partial) flow tree Γ . We will make use of the constructions in the proof of [[Ekh07], Theorem 1.3], where the existence of a family of rigid J -holomorphic disks of Λ converging to Γ is established. This existence is proven by considering a sequence of pre-glued disks $\{w_\lambda\}_{\lambda \rightarrow 0}$, which have explicitly given boundary conditions that are close to the cotangent lift of Γ , and then using a Picard-Floer lemma to find a true J -holomorphic disk u_λ arbitrary close to w_λ for each λ sufficiently small. For details we refer to [Ekh07].

The capping orientation of Γ will be defined to be the capping orientation of the pre-glued disk w_λ , for λ sufficiently small. To derive the algorithm given in Section 3, we will cut the tree and the corresponding pre-glued disk into pieces, orient the pieces, and then glue them back together again. To that end we must also define capping orientations for partial sub flow trees.

In Subsection 6.1 we give a description of the boundary conditions associated to w_λ and the relevant partial flow trees. We also relate Sobolev spaces and $\bar{\partial}$ -operators to these objects. In Subsection 6.2 we define the capping orientation of a sub flow tree, which will be equal to the capping orientation of the corresponding piece of the pre-glued disk w_λ . To take care of the λ -dependence in this definition, we will introduce vector bundles over $(0, \lambda_0]$ for λ_0 sufficiently small. These bundles will have fibers consisting of kernels and cokernels of the $\bar{\partial}$ -operators corresponding to the (sub) flow trees. This enable us to consider the capping sequence given in Section 5.4 not as a sequence of vector spaces, but as a sequence of vector bundles. From this we can prove that the capping orientation of Γ is well-defined if λ is sufficiently small.

There will be a slight difference between the definition of the capping orientation of w_λ given in this section and the one given in Section 5. That is, in this section we will consider the domain of w_λ to be given by the standard domain associated to Γ , while in Section 5 we considered it as given by the punctured unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$. In Subsection 6.3 we describe how this affects orientations.

6.1. Banach spaces associated to trees. Let Γ be a rigid flow tree of Λ , and let w_λ , $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, denote the associated sequence of pre-glued disks. In this subsection we describe a division of the boundary conditions of w_λ into pieces, and associate partial flow trees and $\bar{\partial}$ -operators to these pieces. Then we explain how to glue these pieces together to get arbitrary sub flow trees of Γ , and also to recover the boundary conditions associated to w_λ .

6.1.A. Elementary trees and associated Banach spaces. Let Γ be a rigid flow tree with associated standard domain $\Delta(\Gamma)$. Recall from Section 2 that we have defined a partition of Γ into simpler pieces, called elementary pieces, each of them consisting of only one true vertex of Γ (and associated flow lines). From [Ekh07] it follows that

the corresponding boundary conditions induced by the pre-glued disk w_λ has a certain understandable form over these pieces.

For fixed λ we will to each elementary tree Γ_i associate a standard domain $\Delta(\Gamma_{i,\lambda})$, a trivialized Lagrangian boundary condition $\Theta_i(\lambda)$ and a weight $\mathbf{w}_{\Gamma_i}$ with weight vector μ_{Γ_i} . These data together define Sobolev spaces $\mathcal{H}_{k,\mu}[\Gamma_{i,\lambda}]$, $k = 1, 2$, given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_{i,\lambda}] &= \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu_{\Gamma_i}}[\Theta_i(\lambda)](\Delta(\Gamma_{i,\lambda}), \mathbb{C}^n), \\ \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_{i,\lambda}] &= \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu_{\Gamma_i}}[0](\Delta(\Gamma_{i,\lambda}), \mathbb{C}^n),\end{aligned}$$

and we get an induced $\bar{\partial}$ -operator

$$\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{i,\lambda}} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_{i,\lambda}] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_{i,\lambda}], \quad \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{i,\lambda}}(v) = dv + J \circ dv \circ i.$$

Remark 6.1. To simplify notation, if Δ_{m+1} is a standard domain and $\mathbf{w}_\mu$ is a weight function defined on Δ_{m+1} we say that $\mathbf{w}_\mu$ is (δ) -negative at all infinities if there is a $C > 0$ so that

$$\mathbf{w}_\mu(\tau, t) = \begin{cases} e^{-\delta|\tau|} \text{id} & \text{for } |\tau_i| > C, \quad i = 0, \dots, m \\ \text{id} & \text{for } x \notin \bigcup E_i \end{cases}$$

and a smooth interpolation in between, where (τ_i, t) are local coordinates defined in the strip-like end E_i , $i = 0, \dots, m$, of Δ_{m+1} . The definition of $\mathbf{w}_\mu$ being (δ) -positive at all infinities is similar.

The elementary trees are of the following forms, with associated domains, boundary conditions and weights. We refer to [Ekh07] for an explicit description of the boundary conditions.

- (1₀) *1-pieces* where Γ_i consists of one flow line connecting a true one-valent puncture q and a special puncture. The corresponding standard domain is given by $\Delta(\Gamma_i) = (-\infty, \infty) \times [0, 1]$ with coordinates $(\tau, t) = \tau + it$. The metric of M is flat in a neighborhood of Γ_i . The boundary conditions converge to constant boundary conditions as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, and are explicitly described in [[Ekh07], Section 6.3.2]. (See also Section 5.1.C.)

We define the weight to be given by the following.

q is positive:

$$\mathbf{w}_\lambda(\tau, t) = \begin{cases} e^{-\delta|\tau|} \text{id} & \text{in directions corresponding to } W^u(q) \\ e^{\delta|\tau|} \text{id} & \text{in directions corresponding to } W^s(q) \end{cases}$$

for $\tau < -C$, and

$$\mathbf{w}_\lambda(\tau, t) = \begin{cases} e^{-\delta|\tau|} \text{id} & \text{for } \tau > C \\ \text{id} & \text{for } -C/2 < \tau < C/2 \end{cases}$$

and a smooth interpolation in the regions $(-C, -C/2)$ and $(C/2, C)$.

q is negative:

$$\mathbf{w}_\lambda(\tau, t) = \begin{cases} e^{-\delta|\tau|} \text{id} & \text{in directions corresponding to } W^s(q) \\ e^{\delta|\tau|} \text{id} & \text{in directions corresponding to } W^u(q) \end{cases}$$

for $\tau > C$ and

$$\mathbf{w}_\lambda(\tau, t) = \begin{cases} e^{-\delta|\tau|} \text{id} & \text{for } \tau < -C \\ \text{id} & \text{for } -C/2 < \tau < C/2 \end{cases}$$

and a smooth interpolation in the regions $(-C, -C/2)$ and $(C/2, C)$.

- (1₁) *End pieces* where Γ_i consists of one flow line connecting an end e to a special puncture. The corresponding standard domain is given by $\Delta(\Gamma_i) = (-\infty, \infty) \times [0, 1]$ with coordinates $(\tau, t) = \tau + it$. The metric of M is flat in a neighborhood of Γ_i . The boundary conditions tend to split boundary conditions $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times U_+$, where U_+ denotes a uniform positive π -rotation in a neighborhood of $\tau = \infty$, and is equal to $\mathbb{R}$ away from this region. See [[Ekh07], Section 6.1.3].

The weight is chosen as follows.

$$\mathbf{w}_\lambda(\tau, t) = \begin{cases} e^{\delta|\tau|} \text{id} & \text{in the } W\text{-direction} \\ e^{-\delta|\tau|} \text{id} & \text{in the other directions} \end{cases}$$

for $\tau > C$, and

$$\mathbf{w}_\lambda(\tau, t) = \begin{cases} e^{-\delta|\tau|} \text{id} & \text{for } \tau < -C \\ \text{id} & \text{for } -C/2 < \tau < C/2 \end{cases}$$

and a smooth interpolation in the regions $(-C, -C/2)$ and $(C/2, C)$.

- (2₁) *Switch pieces* where Γ_i consists of one flow line connecting two special punctures and where the flow line passes through a switch. The corresponding standard domain is given by $\Delta(\Gamma_i) = (-\infty, \infty) \times [0, 1]$. The metric of M is flat in a neighborhood of Γ_i . The boundary conditions tend to a split boundary condition $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times U_-$, where U_- denotes a uniform negative π -rotation in a neighborhood of the switch point, and is equal to $\mathbb{R}$ away from this region. See [[Ekh07], Section 6.1.4]. The weight is chosen to be δ -negative at all infinities.
- (2₂) *2-pieces* where Γ_i consists of one flow line connecting two special punctures and where the flow line passes through a 2-valent puncture. The corresponding standard domain is given by $\Delta(\Gamma_i) = \Delta_3$. The metric of M is flat in a neighborhood of Γ_i . The boundary conditions tend to constant $\mathbb{R}^n$ -boundary conditions as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, see [[Ekh07], Section 6.1.7]. The weight is chosen to be δ -positive at the strip-like end corresponding to the 2-valent puncture, and δ -negative at the two other strip-like ends.
- (3₀) *Y_0 -pieces* where Γ_i consists of a Y_0 -vertex connecting three special punctures. The corresponding standard domain is given by $\Delta(\Gamma_i) = \Delta_3$. The metric of M is flat in a neighborhood of Γ_i . The boundary conditions are split and tend to $\mathbb{R}^n$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, see [[Ekh07], Section 6.1.5]. The weight is chosen to be δ -negative at all infinities.
- (3₁) *Y_1 -pieces* where Γ_i consists of a Y_1 -vertex connecting three special punctures. The corresponding standard domain is given by $\Delta(\Gamma_i) = \Delta_3$. The metric of M is flat in a neighborhood of Γ_i . The boundary conditions tend to split boundary conditions $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times U_-$, where U_- denotes a uniform negative π -rotation in a

neighborhood of the boundary minimum, and is equal to $\mathbb{R}$ away from this region. See [[Ekh07], Section 6.1.6]. The weight is chosen to be δ -negative at all infinities.

- (2₀) *Connecting pieces* where Γ_i consists of one flow line connecting two special punctures p_1, p_2 which are punctures of some of the pieces described above. The corresponding standard domain is given by $\Delta(\Gamma_i) = (-\infty, \infty) \times [0, 1]$. There are two kind of connecting pieces; *inner pieces* and *edge point pieces*. For the inner pieces the metric of M is flat in a neighborhood of Γ_i . The boundary conditions are split and tend to $\mathbb{R}^n$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. The weight is chosen to be δ -negative at all infinities. See [[Ekh07], Section 6.1.1]

The edge point pieces bound *edge segments*, and will shrink to points as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 6.2. Note that we choose the weight $\mathbf{w}_\lambda = \mathbf{w}_{\Gamma_i}$ to be independent of λ . We assume that λ_0 is so small so that $\theta_\lambda < \delta$ for all $\lambda < \lambda_0$.

6.1.B. *Sub flow trees and associated Banach spaces.* In this subsection we describe how to glue the elementary trees back together to obtain sub flow trees of Γ . The sub flow trees will have associated Banach spaces, induced by the Banach spaces of the glued elementary pieces. Under this gluing we also get an induced Banach space associated to the pre-glued disk w_λ .

We assume inductively that we have associated Banach spaces $\mathcal{H}_{k,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ and $\bar{\partial}$ -operators to all sub flow trees which have less than m vertices. To define the similar objects for trees with m vertices, we perform gluings of the types (y0g) – (f2), listed in Section 3.

The sub flow trees Γ achieved by the gluings (y0g) – (sgp) inherit the boundary conditions and weights from the partial flow trees used as inputs in the gluing, as described in Section 5.3.A. That is, for each λ sufficiently small we get an associated $\bar{\partial}$ -problem

$$\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda], \quad \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}(v) = dv + J \circ dv \circ i.$$

After having performed the gluing (f0), (f1) or (f2), we obtain the rigid flow tree Γ that we started with, and we recover the boundary condition associated to the pre-glued disk w_λ . Similar to the above we get an associated $\bar{\partial}$ -problem

$$\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} := \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda,\mu} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda].$$

We see that the weight $\mathbf{w}_\mu$ associated to $\bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda,\mu}$ is defined similar to the weight of a J -holomorphic disk given in Section 5.4.B, if we identify Δ_{m+1} with D_{m+1} . The only difference is that in the setting of standard domains we treat ends as marked points, which we did not do when we considered punctured disks. For a more detailed discussion of this topic, see Section 6.3.

It also follows that the boundary conditions Θ_λ induced by w_λ are arbitrarily close to $\mathbb{R}^n$ -boundary conditions for λ small, except in parts corresponding to ends, switches and Y_1 -vertices, where we have split boundary conditions $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times U$, where U is a uniform $\pm\pi$ -rotation, depending on the type of vertex.

Remark 6.3. From [Ekh07] Remark 5.34, it follows that if $u_\lambda : \Delta_{m+1,\lambda} \rightarrow T^*M$ is a sequence of rigid J -holomorphic disks converging to a rigid flow tree as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, then the $\mathbb{R}^{m-2}$ -coordinates of the conformal structure of the corresponding standard domains $\Delta_{m+1}(\lambda)$ tend to ∞ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Moreover, it is proven that the tree determines the coordinates of the conformal structures on $\Delta_{m+1,\lambda}$ within $O(\log(\lambda^{-1}))$. Hence if we scale the coordinates by a factor λ , the conformal structure in the limit is well-defined, up to $O(\lambda \log(\lambda^{-1}))$.

6.2. Capping orientation of flow trees, and vector bundles. In this subsection we define the capping orientation of a (partial) flow tree Γ , and this will be done using the techniques of Section 5.4. That is, the capping orientation of Γ will be defined to be the capping orientation of the corresponding pre-glued disk w_λ . In particular, the definition of the orientation of Γ will depend on λ . To handle this fact, we prove that in this particular setting the gluing sequences from Section 5.3 give exact sequences of vector bundles over $(0, \lambda_0]$ for λ_0 sufficiently small.

6.2.A. Capping orientation of flow trees. Let $\lambda > 0$ be small and fixed. Let Γ be a rigid flow tree, a sub flow tree or an elementary tree, with corresponding $\bar{\partial}$ -operator $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ and with trivialized boundary conditions given by Θ_λ . See Section 6.1. Recall the two auxiliary directions $\text{Aux}_1 \oplus \text{Aux}_2$ introduced in Section 5.4. We extend the boundary conditions Θ_λ to boundary conditions $\tilde{\Theta}_\lambda$ including these two directions, completely analogous to how this was done in Section 5.4.B. We also extend the weights $\mathbf{w}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ in the same manner. We denote the extended problem by $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$.

Remark 6.4. Notice that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \simeq \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$, $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ canonically.

Assume that Γ has a positive puncture q_0 and negative punctures $q_1, \dots, q_m$, ordered as explained in Section 2.4. Let $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{q}_\pm, \lambda}$ denote the associated capping operators as defined in Section 5.4.C, and let $\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda$ denote the fully capped boundary condition associated to $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$, with the auxiliary directions included. Then the *capping sequence* for $\Gamma = \Gamma_\lambda$ is defined to be the sequence

$$(6.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{q}_i-, \lambda} \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{q}_0+, \lambda} \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{q}_i-, \lambda} \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{q}_0+, \lambda} \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda} \rightarrow 0,$$

and the *capping orientation* of Γ_λ is given by the orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ induced by this sequence, where $\det \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ is given the canonical orientation and the capping operators are given their fixed capping orientation.

We will also restrict the operator $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ to the directions corresponding to Λ , and denote this operator by $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$. We refer to the operator $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ as the *fully capped operator* of Γ .

Notice that the sequence (6.1) seems to depend on λ , but we will prove that the induced orientation of Γ is independent of λ , in a certain way. Namely, since the orientation of the fully capped problem is preserved under homotopies of the trivialized boundary condition, and since $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda_\lambda)$ is arbitrarily close to the 0-section in T^*M , we

can homotope the boundary conditions to be constantly equal to $\mathbb{R}^n$ for this problem, except for in uniformly small neighborhoods of ends, switches and Y_1 -vertices where we homotope the boundary conditions to have a $\pm\pi$ -rotation. This homotopy changes the boundary conditions for the capping operators and for the linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -problem corresponding to Γ . We claim that, with our choices of weights on the Sobolev spaces corresponding to the $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ -problem and to the capping operators, we can use the determinant lines over these perturbed problems to orient Γ_λ for λ sufficiently small.

Remark 6.5. We will mainly be interested in what is happening in the directions corresponding to Λ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, since the trivializations in the auxiliary directions are independent of λ . Hence we focus on the $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ -problem in what follows.

6.2.B. *Exact sequences of vector bundles.* To make the above rigorous, we will define vector bundles

$$(6.2) \quad \pi_{\hat{k}} : \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma} \rightarrow (0, \lambda_0], \quad \pi_{\hat{k}}^{-1}(\lambda) = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$$

$$(6.3) \quad \pi_k : \text{Ker } \Gamma \rightarrow (0, \lambda_0], \quad \pi_k^{-1}(\lambda) = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$$

$$(6.4) \quad \pi_c : \text{Coker } \Gamma \rightarrow (0, \lambda_0], \quad \pi_c^{-1}(\lambda) = \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$$

$$(6.5) \quad \pi_{\hat{c}} : \text{Coker } \hat{\Gamma} \rightarrow (0, \lambda_0], \quad \pi_{\hat{c}}^{-1}(\lambda) = \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$$

for some $\lambda_0 > 0$. Note that the fact that $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ is Fredholm only assures that $\det \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ is a vector bundle, but tells us nothing about whether the kernel and cokernel constitute bundles. We will prove that if λ is sufficiently small, then in fact the dimension of the kernel and the cokernel of $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ are independent of λ , and we indeed get vector bundles as above. This will be proved by the inductive procedure where we glue together the elementary pieces of the tree.

We start with some definitions. Let $\pi_1 : E \rightarrow B, \pi_2 : F \rightarrow B$ be two vector bundles over the same base space B . We say that a vector bundle map $v : E \rightarrow F$ is of *rank k* if $v_b : \pi_1^{-1}(b) \rightarrow \pi_2^{-1}(b)$ is of rank k for each $b \in B$.

Definition 6.6. An *exact sequence of vector bundles* is a sequence

$$0 \rightarrow E_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} E_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} \dots \xrightarrow{\alpha_n} E_n \rightarrow 0$$

such that the rank of α_i is constant for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and $\text{im } \alpha_i = \text{Ker } \alpha_{i+1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

The following is straightforward after having fixed orientation conventions as in Section 5.2. Compare with the similar statement in [HT09].

Lemma 6.7. *Let E_1, E_2, F_1, F_2 be trivialized vector bundles over $[0, 1]$, and let*

$$0 \rightarrow E_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} F_1 \xrightarrow{\beta} F_2 \xrightarrow{\gamma} E_2 \rightarrow 0$$

be an exact sequence. Then orientations of three of the spaces $E_1(0), E_2(0), F_1(0), F_2(0)$ canonically induce orientations on $E_1(\lambda), E_2(\lambda), F_1(\lambda), F_2(\lambda)$ for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

Now we describe the topology of the vector bundles (6.2) – (6.5). Recall that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ and $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ denote the kernel and cokernel, respectively, of the operator

$$\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda](\Delta(\Gamma_\lambda), w_\lambda^* TT^* M) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0](\Delta(\Gamma_\lambda), T^{*0,1} \Delta(\Gamma_\lambda) \otimes w_\lambda^* TT^* M).$$

We see that not only the boundary conditions, but also the domain, depend on λ . In fact, by the constructions of the gluings that we use, described below and coming from [Ekh07], we get that $\Delta(\lambda_1) \subset \Delta(\lambda_2)$ if $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1$. Moreover, the standard domains may be assumed to coincide in neighborhoods of all infinities and of all boundary minima, while the inner pieces (where the gluings are performed) of $\Delta(\lambda_2)$ are longer than the corresponding ones for $\Delta(\lambda_1)$. More precisely, we have that the length of the inner pieces is of $O(\lambda^{-1})$. See Figure 18.




FIGURE 18. Comparison of two standard domains corresponding to the same flow tree. The shaded regions represent $\Delta(\lambda_2) \setminus \Delta(\lambda_1)$.

It follows that we can define an inclusion $\iota_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2} : \mathcal{H}_{0,\mu}[\Gamma_{\lambda_1}] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{0,\mu}[\Gamma_{\lambda_2}]$ for $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1$, by extending $v \in \mathcal{H}_{0,\mu}[\Gamma_{\lambda_1}]$ by 0 over $\Delta(\lambda_2) \setminus \Delta(\lambda_1)$. We also extend the weighted L^2 -norm to this setting. First recall that we assume the weight to be given by 1 in compact part of the domain (after gluing), and that $\Delta(\lambda_1) = \Delta(\lambda_2)$ outside these parts. Thus we can extend the weight defined on $\Delta(\lambda_1)$ to $\Delta(\lambda_2)$, $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1$, by defining it to be equal to 1 on $\Delta(\lambda_2) \setminus \Delta(\lambda_1)$. With abuse of notation, we denote all weights by $\mathbf{w}_\mu$.

Remark 6.8. In [Ekh07] one has to pay more attention to the weights, since the gluings in that paper are non-linear. We are considering the linear versions of these gluings, and hence we may assume that all weights are uniformly bounded on compact parts of the standard domains.

Now consider the fiber-wise defined weighted L^2 -norm

$$\|v\|_{\mu,\lambda} = \left(\int_{\Delta(\lambda)} \langle v, v \rangle \mathbf{w}_\mu^2 dm \right)^{1/2} \quad v \in \mathcal{H}_{j,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda], \quad j = 1, 2.$$

We extend it to a pseudo-metric defined on $\pi^{-1}(0, \lambda_0]$, given by

$$(6.6) \quad d_b(v_{\lambda_1}, v_{\lambda_2}) = \|\iota_{\lambda_1, \lambda_0}(v_{\lambda_1}) - \iota_{\lambda_2, \lambda_0}(v_{\lambda_2})\|_{\mu, \lambda_0}$$

for $v_{\lambda_i} \in \mathcal{H}_{j,\mu}[\Gamma_{\lambda_i}]$, $\lambda_i \leq \lambda_0$, $i = 1, 2$. We give the vector bundles (6.2)–(6.5) the topology induced by the metric

$$(6.7) \quad d(v_{\lambda_1}, v_{\lambda_2}) = \sqrt{d_b(v_{\lambda_1}, v_{\lambda_2})^2 + |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|^2}.$$

The main proposition in this section is the following.

Proposition 6.9. *Let $\{\bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda}\}$ and $\{\bar{\partial}_{B_\lambda}\}$, $\lambda \in (0, \lambda']$, be families of Fredholm operators associated to partial flow trees as above. Assume that A_λ can be glued to B_λ at a special puncture p , in the sense of Lemma 5.21, for all $\lambda \in (0, \lambda']$. Also assume the following.*

- (1) *We have vector bundles $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A$, $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_B$, $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_A$ and $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_B$ over $(0, \lambda']$ with topology as described in (6.7).*
- (2) *If p_i is any special puncture of the tree corresponding to U , $U = A, B$, then $\text{ev}_{p_i} : \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is continuous.*
- (3) *$\dim \text{ev}_p(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{U_\lambda}) = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{U_\lambda}$ for $\lambda \in (0, \lambda']$, $U = A, B$.*

Then there is a $0 < \lambda_0 \leq \lambda'$ so that (1)–(3) hold for the glued operator $\bar{\partial}_{(A\#B)_\lambda}$. Moreover, the gluing sequences from Lemma 5.21 descend to exact sequences of vector bundles.

Remark 6.10. That the assumptions in the proposition hold for elementary trees is proved in Section 8.2, using Proposition A.3 from Appendix A.

Remark 6.11. We have similar results for the fully capped problems $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{A}}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{B}}$.

Proof. We start by proving that (1)–(3) also hold for the glued operator. This is essentially [[Ekh07], Proposition 6.20], but we give an outline of the main arguments. We start by proving that the dimensions of the glued kernels and cokernels are constant.

First, Lemma 5.21 implies that for each λ there is a gluing parameter $\rho = \rho(\lambda)$ so that the gluing sequence is exact. In particular we get that

$$(6.8) \quad \text{index } \bar{\partial}_{(A\#B)_\lambda} = \text{index } \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda} + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_{B_\lambda} + n.$$

Next we describe the gluing region. In our setting we may assume that this region is of size $O(\lambda^{-1})$, and that the gluing region corresponding to λ_1 is contained in the gluing region corresponding to λ_2 if $\lambda_2 > \lambda_1$. I.e., we may replace ρ in Lemma 5.21 with λ^{-1} . Let ϕ_A^λ and ϕ_B^λ be the cut-off functions corresponding to the cut-off functions $\phi_A^\rho = \phi_A^{\lambda^{-1}}$ and $\phi_B^\rho = \phi_B^{\lambda^{-1}}$ defined by the formulas (5.23) and (5.24), respectively. We assume that $|D^k \phi_U^\lambda| = O(\lambda)$, $k = 1, 2$, $|\phi_\lambda^U - \phi_c^U| = O(\frac{\lambda - 2c}{2\lambda})$, $|D(\phi_{\lambda_1}^U - \phi_{\lambda_2}^U)| = O(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)$, $U = A, B$.

Let $W_p(U) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ so that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} (\text{ev}_p(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{U_\lambda})) = W_p(U)$, $U = A, B$. By the hypothesis (2) we can find vectors $u_1^{U,\lambda}, \dots, u_m^{U,\lambda} \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{U_\lambda}$ for $U = A, B$, such that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{Span}(\text{ev}_p(u_1^{U,\lambda}), \dots, \text{ev}_p(u_m^{U,\lambda})) = W_p(A) \cap W_p(B).$$

Moreover, we can choose these vectors to depend continuously on λ and to have norm 1, and so that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(u_i^{A,\lambda}) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(u_i^{B,\lambda})$, $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Using the arguments from the proof of [[Ekh07], Proposition 6.20], there are functions $r_i^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[(A \# B)_\lambda]$ supported in a neighborhood of p so that

$$\bar{\partial}(\phi_A^\lambda u_i^{A,\lambda} + \phi_B^\lambda u_i^{B,\lambda}) = -\bar{\partial}(r_i^\lambda), \quad i = 1, \dots, m.$$

From this we see that $\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{(A \# B)_\lambda} \geq \dim W_p(A) \cap W_p(B)$. Moreover, from the exactness of the gluing sequence, and by using the nature of the map $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{B_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ together with the assumption (3), we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{(A \# B)_\lambda} &\leq \dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda} + \dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{B_\lambda} \\ &\quad + n - \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda} - \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{B_\lambda} - \dim W_p(A) \cap W_p(B). \end{aligned}$$

From this and the equality (6.8) it follows that $\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{(A \# B)_\lambda} = \dim W_p(A) \cap W_p(B)$ and hence $\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{(A \# B)_\lambda}$ and $\dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{(A \# B)_\lambda}$ are constant.

Moreover, by the elliptic estimates from [EES05a] on the strip with positive weights (i.e. in the gluing region, where r_i^λ is assumed to have its support, and where the glued weight is large at the ends) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \|r_i^\lambda\|_{2,w_\rho} &\leq C \|\bar{\partial}(\phi_A^\lambda u_i^{A,\lambda} + \phi_B^\lambda u_i^{B,\lambda})\|_{2,w_\rho} \\ &\leq \tilde{C} \left(\|\bar{\partial}(\phi_A^\lambda) u_i^{A,\lambda}\|_{2,w_\rho} + \|\bar{\partial}(\phi_B^\lambda) u_i^{B,\lambda}\|_{2,w_\rho} \right) = O(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

for $j = 1, 2$. Here $\rho = \lambda^{-1}$ indicates the gluing parameter in the weight (which is important during the gluing, but not after). From this it follows that we get a vector bundle $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A \# B}$ satisfying the requirements (1)–(3). That the assumption (1) holds for the cokernel follows from the fact that the determinant lines of Fredholm operators form a vector bundle.

Now we prove that the sequences in Lemma 5.21 also give exact sequences in the category of vector bundles. We prove it in the case (5.22), the other cases are similar.

First we modify the notation as follows. Let $\alpha_\lambda = (\alpha_\lambda^A, \alpha_\lambda^B)$ denote the first non-trivial map in the sequence (5.20), $\beta_\lambda = (\beta_\lambda^A, \beta_\lambda^B)$ the second one and γ_λ the third one, recalling that we assume the gluing parameter ρ to be given by $\rho = 1/\lambda$.

Let $\lambda_0 > 0$ be such that we have vector bundles $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A$, $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_B$, $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_A$, $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_B$, $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B}$ and $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B}$ defined over $(0, \lambda_0]$. Fix vector bundle trivializations

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_G &: \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B} \rightarrow (0, \lambda_0] \times \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{(A\#B)\lambda_0} \\ \psi_A &: \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A \rightarrow (0, \lambda_0] \times \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A\lambda_0} \\ \psi_B &: \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_B \rightarrow (0, \lambda_0] \times \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{B\lambda_0} \\ \tilde{\psi}_A &: \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_A \rightarrow (0, \lambda_0] \times \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A\lambda_0} \\ \tilde{\psi}_B &: \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_B \rightarrow (0, \lambda_0] \times \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{B\lambda_0} \\ \tilde{\psi}_G &: \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A\#B} \rightarrow (0, \lambda_0] \times \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{(A\#B)\lambda_0}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\bar{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_{k_1})$ be an orthonormal basis for $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{(A\#B)\lambda_0}$, $\bar{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_{k_2})$ an orthonormal basis for $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A\lambda_0}$, $\bar{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{k_3})$ an orthonormal basis for $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{B\lambda_0}$, and let $\bar{u}'$, $\bar{v}'$ and $\bar{w}'$ be defined similar for $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{(A\#B)\lambda_0}$, $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A\lambda_0}$ and $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{B\lambda_0}$, respectively. Let

$$\bar{u}_\lambda = (u_1^\lambda, \dots, u_{k_1}^\lambda) = (\psi_{G,\lambda}^{-1}(u_1), \dots, \psi_{G,\lambda}^{-1}(u_{k_1}))$$

be a basis for $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{(A\#B)\lambda_0}$, and without loss of generality assume that it is orthonormal. We define bases for the other spaces in a completely analogous way.

To prove that the families α_λ , β_λ and γ_λ give vector bundle maps it is enough to prove that the families of functions

$$\begin{aligned}g_{1,\lambda} &:= (\psi_{A,\lambda} \circ \alpha_\lambda^A \circ \psi_{G,\lambda}^{-1}, \psi_{B,\lambda} \circ \alpha_\lambda^B \circ \psi_{G,\lambda}^{-1}) \\ &\in L(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{(A\#B)\lambda_0}, \iota(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A\lambda_0}) \oplus \iota(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{B\lambda_0})),\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}g_{2,\lambda} &:= (\tilde{\psi}_{A,\lambda} \circ \beta_\lambda^A \circ (\psi_{A,\lambda}^{-1}, \psi_{B,\lambda}^{-1}), \tilde{\psi}_{B,\lambda} \circ \beta_\lambda^B \circ (\psi_{A,\lambda}^{-1}, \psi_{B,\lambda}^{-1})) \\ &\in L(\iota(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A\lambda_0}) \oplus \iota(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{B\lambda_0}), \iota(\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A\lambda_0}) \oplus \iota(\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{B\lambda_0}))\end{aligned}$$

and

$$g_{3,\lambda} := (\tilde{\psi}_{G,\lambda} \circ \gamma_\lambda \circ (\tilde{\psi}_{A,\lambda}^{-1}, \tilde{\psi}_{B,\lambda}^{-1}) \in L(\iota(\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A\lambda_0}) \oplus \iota(\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{B\lambda_0}), \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{(A\#B)\lambda_0})$$

depend continuously on λ . Here ι denotes the inclusion of the kernels and cokernels into $\mathcal{H}_{i,w,\lambda}[(A\#B)_\lambda]$ for $i = 2$ and $i = 1$, respectively, which is done by multiplying by the cut-off functions ϕ_A^λ and ϕ_B^λ .

We start by proving the statement for $g_{1,\lambda}$. That is, we must prove that for each fixed $c \in (0, \lambda_0]$ we have that

$$\|g_{1,\lambda_n}(u) - g_{1,c}(u)\|_{\mu,\lambda_0} \rightarrow 0$$

uniformly as $\lambda_n \rightarrow c$. Here we assume that $\lambda_n < c$. Since the domain of the maps are finite-dimensional (and the maps are linear in u) the uniform convergence is automatically satisfied once we have proved that the convergence holds pointwise.

We will prove this component-wise, and thus it is enough to prove that for each $u \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{(A \# B)_{\lambda_0}}$ we have that

$$I(g_1) := \left\| \left(\int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle \psi_{G,\lambda_n}^{-1}(u), \phi_U^{\lambda_n} x_{i,\lambda_n} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm \right) \phi_U^{\lambda_n} \psi_{U,\lambda_n}(x_{i,\lambda_n}) - \left(\int_{\Delta(c)} \langle \psi_{G,c}^{-1}(u), \phi_U^c x_{i,c} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm \right) \phi_U^c \psi_{U,c}(x_{i,c}) \right\|_{\mu,\lambda_0} \rightarrow 0$$

as $\lambda_n \rightarrow c$, where $U = A, B$, $x_i = v_i$ if $U = A$ and $x_i = w_i$ if $U = B$.

We estimate this from above, and recall that we assume the weight on $\Delta(\lambda_n)$ to be given by the weight on $\Delta(c)$, restricted to $\Delta(\lambda_n)$. We also use that $\phi_U^{\lambda_n}$ can be smoothly extended by 0 over $\Delta(c) \setminus \Delta(\lambda_n)$, $U = A, B$, to think of cut-off functions on $\Delta(c)$ to be defined on $\Delta(\lambda_n)$, and vice versa. We get

$$I(g_1) \leq (I_1 + I_2 + I_3) \cdot \underbrace{\|\phi_U^{\lambda_n} \psi_{U,\lambda_n}(x_{i,\lambda_n})\|_{\mu,\lambda_0}}_{N_4} + \underbrace{\left| \int_{\Delta(c)} \langle \psi_{G,c}^{-1}(u), \phi_U^c x_{i,c} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm \right|}_{I_5} \cdot (N_6 + N_7)$$

where

$$I_1 = \left| \int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle \psi_{G,\lambda_n}^{-1}(u) - \psi_{G,c}^{-1}(u), \phi_U^{\lambda_n} x_{i,\lambda_n} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm \right| \leq \|\psi_{G,\lambda_n}^{-1}(u) - \psi_{G,c}^{-1}(u)\|_{\mu,\lambda_n} \cdot \|\phi_U^{\lambda_n} x_{i,\lambda_n}\|_{\mu,\lambda_n} \rightarrow 0, \quad \lambda_n \rightarrow c,$$

$$I_2 = \left| \int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle \psi_{G,c}^{-1}(u), \phi_U^{\lambda_n} (x_{i,\lambda_n} - x_{i,c}) \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm \right| \leq \|\psi_{G,c}^{-1}(u)\|_{\mu,\lambda_n} \cdot \|x_{i,\lambda_n} - x_{i,c}\|_{\mu,\lambda_n} \rightarrow 0, \quad \lambda_n \rightarrow c,$$

$$I_3 = \left| \int_{\Delta(c)} \langle \psi_{G,c}^{-1}(u), (\phi_U^{\lambda_n} - \phi_U^c)(x_{i,c}) \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm \right| \leq \|\psi_{G,c}^{-1}(u)\|_{\mu,c} \cdot \|(\phi_U^{\lambda_n} - \phi_U^c)(x_{i,c})\|_{\mu,c} \leq 1 \cdot \|(\phi_U^c - \phi_U^{\lambda_n})\|_{\infty} \cdot \|x_{i,c}\|_{\mu,c} = O\left(\frac{\lambda_n - 2c}{2\lambda_n}\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \lambda_n \rightarrow c,$$

$$N_6 = \|\phi_U^{\lambda_n} (\psi_{U,\lambda_n}(x_{i,\lambda_n}) - \psi_{U,c}(x_{i,c}))\|_{\mu,\lambda_0} \leq \|\psi_{U,\lambda_n}(x_{i,\lambda_n}) - \psi_{U,c}(x_{i,c})\|_{\mu,\lambda_0} \rightarrow 0, \quad \lambda_n \rightarrow c,$$

$$N_7 = \|(\phi_U^{\lambda_n} - \phi_U^c) \psi_{U,c}(x_{i,c})\|_{\mu,\lambda_0} \leq \|\phi_U^{\lambda_n} - \phi_U^c\|_{\infty} \cdot \|\psi_{U,c}(x_{i,c})\|_{\mu,\lambda_0} = O\left(\frac{\lambda_n - 2c}{2\lambda_n}\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \lambda_n \rightarrow c,$$

and where

$$N_4 \leq 1$$

$$I_5 \leq \|\psi_{G,c}^{-1}(u)|_{\mu,c} \cdot \|\phi_U^c x_{i,c}\|_{\mu,c} \leq 1,$$

everything uniformly as $\lambda_n \rightarrow c$. It follows that $\alpha = \{\alpha_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]}$ defines a bundle map.

We get similar estimates for $g_{2,\lambda}$ and $g_{3,\lambda}$, but here we in addition need to use that $\|D(\phi_U^{\lambda_1} - \phi_U^{\lambda_2})\|_\infty = O(|\lambda_2 - \lambda_1|)$. $\square$

6.3. Viewing ends as marked points, and its affect on orientations. Let Γ be a rigid flow tree of index $(\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}) \leq 0$, fix $\lambda > 0$ and let w_λ be the associated pre-glued disk. Recall that when we defined the capping orientation of w_λ in Section 5.4 we considered the domain of the disk to be given by the unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$, with punctures on the boundary representing the punctures of w_λ . In Subsection 6.2, however, we considered the domain of w_λ to be given by a standard domain, with punctures on the boundary representing both punctures of w_λ but also the end-vertices of Γ . It turns out that the latter setting is more geometrically suitable when it comes to computing the sign of Γ explicitly, and is the one that we will use in the inductively calculation. Thus we need to discuss the affect on orientations of regarding the ends as punctures.

Let $\bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$ denote the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem

$$\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[w_\lambda](D_{m+1}, w_\lambda^* TT^* M) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0](D_{m+1}, T^{*0,1} D_{m+1} \otimes w_\lambda^* TT^* M)$$

as defined in Section 5.1.D, and let $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ denote the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem defined in Subsection 6.1 (where the punctured disk D_{m+1} is replaced by the standard domain $\Delta(\Gamma_\lambda)$). Let $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ denote the corresponding fully capped problems. (Here we have neglected the auxiliary directions.) The difference between $\bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ (and between $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$) is that the domain of the latter $\bar{\partial}$ -problem does not contain vector fields that are non-vanishing in the direction perpendicular to Σ at the end points.

To see how this affects orientations, we need to fix some conventions. So assume that Γ has m negative punctures and let $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ be the space of conformal structures for the disk D_{m+1} , where we have not put marked points at the ends. Give $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ the orientation from Section 5.2.D. Similarly, let $\mathcal{C}_{m+1+e(\Gamma)}$ be the space of conformal structures for the disk $D_{m+1+e(\Gamma)}$ where we have put marked points on ∂D_{m+1} representing the end-vertices of Γ . Note that this domain can be given a conformal structure so that it is conformally equivalent to $\Delta(\Gamma_\lambda)$.

Let $e_i \in \partial D_{m+1+e(\Gamma)}$ correspond to the i th end of Γ , where we have numbered the ends in the order they occur along the boundary of D_{m+1} when going along the boundary in the counter-clockwise direction. Let v_i be a vector field supported in a neighborhood of e_i , being tangent to the boundary of D_{m+1} along the boundary, pointing in the counter-clockwise direction of the boundary. Let $V(e(\Gamma)) = \text{Span}(v_1, \dots, v_{e(\Gamma)})$, oriented, and give $\mathcal{C}_{m+1+e(\Gamma)}$ the orientation induced by

$$(6.9) \quad T\mathcal{C}_{m+1+e(\Gamma)} = T\mathcal{C}_{m+1} \oplus V(e(\Gamma))$$

where $\mathcal{C}_{m+1}$ is oriented as above.

Lemma 6.12. *There is a splitting $V(e(\Gamma)) = \mathbb{R}^{c(e)} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{k(e)}$ together with isomorphisms*

$$(6.10) \quad \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} = \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda} \oplus V(e(\Gamma))$$

$$(6.11) \quad \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} = \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{c(e)}$$

$$(6.12) \quad \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{k(e)}.$$

Proof. The isomorphism 6.10 follows from the similar construction in [EES05b].

To prove the identifications (6.11) and (6.12), we consider the map

$$\Psi := \bar{\partial} : V(e(\Gamma)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda],$$

where we have perturbed the vector fields in $V(e(\Gamma))$ to be holomorphic along the boundary. We regard this as a construction similar to the stabilization of a Fredholm operator, to define an operator

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial} \oplus \Psi &: \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \oplus V(e(\Gamma)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \\ (u, v) &\mapsto \bar{\partial}(u + v). \end{aligned}$$

Then we get that $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \oplus \Psi) \simeq \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda}$, and in addition we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \rightarrow V(e(\Gamma)) \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \rightarrow 0.$$

The result follows. $\square$

Now we compare the two different capping sequences of w_λ . That is, we compare the capping sequence given in Section 5.4 with the capping sequence given in Subsection 6.2.A. To do this, we must take the auxiliary directions into account. So recall that we have defined extensions of the operators $\bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ to the auxiliary directions, and that the extended problems give isomorphisms in these directions. Also recall that we have similar extension for the operators $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$, and that this gives rise to surjective problems in the auxiliary directions, but that we might have non-trivial kernel here. Nevertheless, in these directions the kernel of the extended $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda}$ -problem will be isomorphic to the kernel of the extended $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ -problem. We denote this kernel by $\text{Aux } \Gamma$. (Recall that the problem is independent of λ in the auxiliary directions).

Let $\text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda) \subset \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$ be a subspace so that $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda} \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \oplus \text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, and recall that we use the notation $\text{cap}(\Gamma_A) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{q}_{i,-}} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{q}_{0,+}}$ oriented, where $q_0, \dots, q_m$ are the punctures of w_λ . Here we neglect the λ -dependence. Then the capping sequence (5.27) can be written as

$$(6.13) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \\ \mathbb{R}^{k(e)} \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{cap}(\Gamma_A) \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \\ \text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \rightarrow 0,$$

and the capping sequence (6.1) can be written as

$$(6.14) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{cap}(\Gamma_A) \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \\ \text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda) \\ \mathbb{R}^{k(e)} \\ \mathbb{R}^{c(e)} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \\ \mathbb{R}^{c(e)} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0.$$

To compare the difference in orientation induced on w_λ via these two sequences, we fix orientations of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$, $\text{Aux } \Gamma$ and $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda}$. This induces an orientation on $\mathbb{R}^{k(e)}$ by using the identification (6.12) together with the requirement that the pair $(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma, \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda})$ is given the canonical orientation. This, in addition, induces an orientation of $\mathbb{R}^{c(e)}$ by requiring that

$$V(e(\Gamma)) = \mathbb{R}^{k(e)} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{c(e)} \quad \text{oriented.}$$

Lemma 6.13. *Let $\mathcal{O}_1$ be the orientation of TC_{m+1} induced by the identification*

$$TC_{m+1} = \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \oplus \text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda)$$

where $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \oplus \text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda) \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$ is given the orientation induced by sequence (6.13). Let $\mathcal{O}_2$ be the orientation of TC_{m+1} induced by the identification

$$TC_{m+1} \oplus V(e(\Gamma)) = \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \oplus \text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \mathbb{R}^{k(e)} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{c(e)}$$

where $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} \oplus \text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \mathbb{R}^{k(e)} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{c(e)} \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ is given the orientation induced by the sequence (6.14). Then

$$\mathcal{O}_1 = (-1)^\sigma \mathcal{O}_2$$

where

$$\sigma = e(\Gamma) \cdot \dim \text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda) + k(e) \cdot (c(e) + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma).$$

Proof. From the first sequence the space $\text{cap}_A(\Gamma)$ gets the induced orientation

$$\text{cap}_A(\Gamma) = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \oplus \mathbb{R}^{k(e)} \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma \oplus \text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda)$$

and from the second sequence it gets the orientation

$$\text{cap}_A(\Gamma) = (-1)^{c(e)(\dim \text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda) + k(e))} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma \oplus \text{ck}(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \mathbb{R}^{k(e)}.$$

The result follows. $\square$

In applications it will simplify to think about the standard domain $\Delta_{m+1+e(\Gamma)}$ instead of the punctured disk D_{m+1} with marked points at the ends. It will also simplify to think about the orientation of $\mathcal{C}_{m+1+e(\Gamma)}$ as given in Section 5.2.D, where we view the ends as punctures. We have the following.

Lemma 6.14. *Let $\mathcal{O}_1$ be the orientation of $\mathcal{C}_{m+1+e(\Gamma)}$ given by (6.9) and let $\mathcal{O}_2$ be the orientation of $\mathcal{C}_{m+1+e(\Gamma)}$ given in Section 5.2.D. Then*

$$\mathcal{O}_1 = (-1)^\mu \mathcal{O}_2$$

where μ is given in Definition 2.16.

Proof. We prove the formula in the case $p_1 = e_1$, $p_2 = e_2$, following the notation from Section 2.5. The other cases are similar.

We must replace $p_{l_1} = q_1, p_{l_2} = q_2 \in \{p_3, \dots, p_m\}$ with $p_1 = e_1$ and $p_2 = e_2$, respectively. From [[EES05b], Lemma 4.6], we get that

$$\begin{aligned} & p_2 \wedge p_2 \wedge \dots \wedge p_{l_1-1} \wedge p_{l_1+1} \wedge \dots \wedge p_{l_2-1} \wedge p_{l_2+1} \wedge \dots \wedge p_m \\ &= (-1)^{l_2-1-l_1} p_3 \wedge \dots \wedge p_m. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. $\square$

7. STABILIZATION OF CAPPING SEQUENCES

In this section we will stabilize the operators $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ so that they become surjective. This will allow us to understand the orientation of Γ as an orientation of the flow out $\mathcal{F}(\Gamma)$ in M .

To stabilize $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ we use the constructions in [EENS13] and [Ekh07]. That is, we define a vector space $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ spanned by vector fields along Γ representing the conformal variations. We then add this space to the domain of $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$, and extend the operator over this space so that it becomes a surjective operator. See Subsection 7.1. Similarly, the operator $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ is stabilized by a space $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ consisting of cut-off, covariantly constant vector fields with support in neighborhoods of the Y_1 - and switch-vertices, pointing perpendicular to Σ . See Subsection 7.2.

As already discussed in Section 5.2, the stabilizations will affect the orientations of the trees in the capping- and gluing sequences. In Subsection 7.3 we relate the spaces $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ and $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$ to these sequences. In Subsection 7.4 and Subsection 7.5 we then use this to calculate the signs needed to compensate for the stabilizations. It is these signs that show up in the definitions in Section 3.4.

In this section we will throughout work with problems where we regard the end-vertices of Γ as punctures of the domains of the disks. We will also use the splittings of the $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ - and $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}^\circ$ -operators into directions corresponding to Λ and directions corresponding to the auxiliary directions. That is, we will use the canonical isomorphisms

$$\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda} \simeq \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}, \quad \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda} \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$$

and

$$(7.1) \quad \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}^\circ \simeq \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda} \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma, \quad \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}^\circ \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}$$

where $\text{Aux } \Gamma$ denotes the kernel of $\bar{\partial}_{\tilde{\Gamma}_\lambda}^\circ$ restricted to the auxiliary directions.

7.1. Stabilization by adding conformal variations. We start by describing how to interpret representatives of cokernel elements as vector fields along Γ . Recall the fully linearized operator

$$(7.2) \quad D\bar{\partial}_{(u,\kappa)} := \bar{\partial}_u \oplus \Psi_\kappa : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[u] \oplus T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0]$$

associated to a rigid J -holomorphic disk u with conformal structure κ . This induces an isomorphism

$$(7.3) \quad T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1} \simeq \Psi_\kappa(T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}) \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_u,$$

where Ψ_κ is given by

$$(7.4) \quad \Psi_\kappa : T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0], \quad \gamma \mapsto J \circ du \circ \gamma.$$

Here the conformal variation γ is interpreted as $\gamma = \partial_t \gamma_t|_{t=0}$ where γ_t is a path of endomorphisms on $T\Delta_{m+1}$ satisfying $\gamma_0 = i$, $\gamma_t^2 = -1$.

Now let Γ be a rigid flow tree and let $w_\lambda : \Delta(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow T^*M$ be the associated pre-glued disk for $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small. Let γ_i denote the conformal variation corresponding

to moving the i th boundary minimum of $\Delta(\Gamma_\lambda)$ towards $-\infty$. Following [Ekh07], we get that the map (7.4) can be given as

$$(7.5) \quad \Psi_\kappa(\gamma_i) = -\bar{\partial}_\kappa(\beta_i \partial w_\lambda \cdot c \lambda^{-1} \partial_\tau)$$

where β_i is a smooth cut-off function supported in a neighborhood of the i th boundary minimum, $c > 0$ is a small constant, and λ^{-1} is needed to get good asymptotic behavior as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

We let $v_i(\lambda) = -\beta_i \partial w_\lambda \cdot c \lambda^{-1} \partial_t$ and we define

$$(7.6) \quad V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda) := \text{Span}(v_2(\lambda), \dots, v_{m-1}(\lambda)).$$

Lemma 7.1. *The vector $v_i(\lambda)$ has a well-defined limit as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, realized as a vector field in M along Γ , pointing in the direction of Γ against the flow direction (towards the positive puncture), and supported in a neighborhood of the vertex of Γ corresponding to the i th boundary minimum.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that w_λ is flow-like for small λ , that the order of the derivative of w_λ is λ , and the scaling by λ^{-1} . See [Ekh07]. $\square$

Using Lemma 7.1 we define a vector bundle $V_{\text{con}}(\underline{\Gamma}) \simeq [0, \lambda_0] \times \mathbb{R}^{m-2}$ with fibers $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$. We give $V_{\text{con}}(\underline{\Gamma})$ the topology induced by the trivialization

$$(v_2(\lambda), \dots, v_{m-1}(\lambda)) \mapsto (\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{m-2}}).$$

Then the evaluation map from $V_{\text{con}}(\underline{\Gamma})$ composed with the projection to TM is well-defined and continuous, and gives vector fields in TM along Γ tangent to Γ , supported in neighborhoods of Y_0 - and Y_1 -vertices and 2-valent punctures.

Notice that we have a natural vector bundle $T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}(\underline{\Gamma}) \simeq [0, \lambda_0] \times \mathbb{R}^{m-2}$ with a trivialization given by $(t_2, \dots, t_{m-1}) \mapsto (\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{m-2}})$. It follows that for each pre-glued disk w_λ we can define an orientation-preserving isomorphism

$$\eta_\lambda : T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$$

given by

$$t_j \mapsto \eta_\lambda(t_j) = v_j(\lambda), \quad j = 2, \dots, m-1,$$

and this map extends to a bundle map $\eta : T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}(\underline{\Gamma}) \rightarrow V_{\text{con}}(\underline{\Gamma})$.

Remark 7.2. Since we identify the space $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$ with $T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1}$, we sometimes think of $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ as spanned by the vectors $v_1(\lambda), \dots, \hat{v}_j(\lambda), \dots, v_{m-1}(\lambda)$. The map η is extended to this setting by defining $\eta_\lambda(t_1) = v_1(\lambda)$.

If $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ is a partial flow tree, then let $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma'_\lambda)$ be the conformal variations of Γ' inherited by those from Γ . That is, $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma'_\lambda)$ consists of the vectors in $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ having support on the part of the standard domain of Γ corresponding to Γ' .

Moreover, assume that Γ is a sub flow tree obtained by gluing two sub flow trees Γ_1 and Γ_2 together via a Y_0 - or Y_1 -piece Γ' . Then we let

$$V_{\text{con,pre}}(\Gamma) = V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2).$$

Similarly, if Γ is obtained by gluing a sub flow tree Γ_1 to a 2-piece Γ' , we let

$$V_{\text{con,pre}}(\Gamma) = V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1).$$

We see that

$$V_{\text{con,pre}}(\Gamma) \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma') = V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma).$$

Notice that if Γ is a true flow tree, or if Γ is a sub flow tree containing the positive puncture of the true flow tree to which it belongs, then we have $V_{\text{con,pre}}(\Gamma) = V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$.

Now let Γ be a rigid flow tree or a sub flow tree. We define two stabilized operators associated to Γ by

$$(7.7) \quad \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$$

$$(7.8) \quad \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, ps} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \oplus V_{\text{con,pre}}(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda],$$

acting as $\bar{\partial}$ on both spaces, and where the two operators coincides and give isomorphisms if Γ is rigid.

The following result is found in [Ekh07].

Lemma 7.3 ([Ekh07], Proposition 6.20). *Assume that Γ is a sub flow tree or a rigid flow tree. If λ sufficiently small, then*

the operators $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, ps}$ are surjective Fredholm operators and

$$\text{index}(\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s}) = \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}) + \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma),$$

$$\text{index}(\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, ps}) = \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}) + \dim V_{\text{con,pre}}(\Gamma).$$

Moreover, if Γ is a sub flow tree with special puncture q , then ev_q restricted to $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s}$ is injective, and $\text{ev}_q(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s}) \rightarrow \text{ev}_q \Omega(\Gamma)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

7.2. Stabilization by adding constant vector fields supported at Y_1 - and switch-vertices. To stabilize the fully capped operator $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ associated to a (sub) flow tree, we will add covariantly constant, cut-off vector fields supported in neighborhoods of the switches and Y_1 -vertices. We call these vectors *cuspidal-stabilization vectors*.

We start with a preliminary lemma. Recall that $\text{cap}(\Gamma) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{q_i, -} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{q_0, +}$ where $q_0, \dots, q_m$ are the punctures of Γ (here we neglect the λ -dependence).

Lemma 7.4. *Assume that Γ is a rigid (sub) flow tree, and let λ be sufficiently small. Then we have*

$$(7.9) \quad \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}) = n - \dim \text{cap}(\Gamma) - s(\Gamma) - Y_1(\Gamma),$$

$$(7.10) \quad \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}) = n - s(\Gamma) - Y_1(\Gamma).$$

In particular, if $\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} = 0$, then we have

$$(7.11) \quad \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda) = \dim \text{cap}(\Gamma) + s(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma) - n.$$

Proof. The first equality follows from [[Ekh07], Proposition 3.18], noting that we treat all ends as marked points, and thus they contribute with 0 in the formula (the $+\pi$ -rotation in the Maslov index, which rises the Fredholm index by 1, is lowered by 1 by the marked point).

The second equality follows from the first one together with the exact sequence (6.1), neglecting the auxiliary directions, which gives

$$(7.12) \quad \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}) = \dim \text{cap}(\Gamma) + \text{index}(\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}).$$

The third equation follows from $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma) \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$. $\square$

Now we define the cusp-stabilization vectors. Recall that, close to each switch or Y_1 -vertex, we may assume that we have split coordinates $\mathbb{C}^{n-1} \oplus \mathbb{C}$, where the induced boundary condition makes a $-\pi$ turn in the last coordinate, and is constantly equal to $\mathbb{R}$ in the other ones. Moreover, by the results in [Ekh07], the $-\pi$ -rotation is performed in a neighborhood $U(C_\lambda)$ of the point $p \in \partial\Delta(\Gamma_\lambda)$ which is mapped to the switch or the Y_1 -vertex, and is constantly $\mathbb{R}^n$ away from $U(C_\lambda)$. Here $U(C_\lambda)$ is a neighborhood of size C_λ , where $C_\lambda = O(\lambda^{-1})$ is a constant depending continuously on λ .

Let $\phi_p^\lambda : \Delta(\lambda) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a cut-off function having support in $U(2C_\lambda)$, and which is equal to 1 in $U(C_\lambda)$. We choose the family ϕ_p^λ to be C^2 in λ , and so that $|D^k(\phi_s^\lambda)| = O(\lambda)$, $k = 1, 2$. Assume that $\Pi(\Lambda_p) = \{x_n \leq 0\}$, where Λ_p denotes the sheets of Λ containing the image of p , and recall that we can identify T^*M with $\mathbb{C}^n$ in a neighborhood of the cotangent lift of Γ at p .

Definition 7.5. We define the *cusp-stabilization vector at p* to be the vector field v_p^λ given by

$$v_p^\lambda = \phi_p^\lambda \partial_{x_n} : \Delta(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n.$$

Remark 7.6. By the flow-analysis in [Ekh07] it follows that the images of the neighborhoods $U(C_\lambda)$ have a well-defined limit under the corresponding map w_λ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, and hence we get a well-defined limit $v_p^0 = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} v_p^\lambda$ given by evaluation along Γ .

Let

$$\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda) = \bigoplus_{p \in s(\Gamma) \cup Y_1(\Gamma)} \text{Span}(v_p^\lambda)$$

denote the *space of cusp-stabilizations*, and give this space the orientation induced by the order of which the switches and Y_1 -vertices occur along $\partial\Delta$. That is, suppose that Γ has switches s_1, s_2, s_3 and Y_1 -vertices v_1, v_2 , say. When we go along the boundary of Δ , starting at the positive puncture moving in the direction given by the orientation of the boundary, then assume that we first come to the boundary minimum mapped to v_1 , then to the point mapped to s_1 , then to the point mapped to s_2 , then to the boundary minimum mapped to v_2 and last to the point mapped to s_3 . In this case we then get

$$\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda) = \text{Span}(v_{v_1}^\lambda, v_{s_1}^\lambda, v_{s_2}^\lambda, v_{v_2}^\lambda, v_{s_3}^\lambda)$$

oriented.

It follows that if λ_0 is sufficiently small, then we get a vector bundle $\mathcal{E}(\underline{\Gamma})$ over $(0, \lambda_0]$ with fibers $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, a trivialization $\xi : \mathcal{E}(\underline{\Gamma}) \rightarrow (0, \lambda_0] \times \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_{\lambda_0})$, $\xi_\lambda(v_p^\lambda) = v_p^{\lambda_0}$, and with a topology making the evaluation map to TM continuous.

Now we stabilize the fully capped problem associated to Γ by adding the space $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ to the domain of the corresponding $\bar{\partial}$ -operator. That is, for each λ sufficiently small we get an operator

$$(7.13) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \oplus \Phi_\lambda : & \mathcal{H}_2[\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda] \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda) & \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1[0] \\ & (u, v) & \mapsto \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}(u) + \Phi_\lambda(v) \end{array}$$

where

$$\Phi_\lambda(v_p^\lambda) = \bar{\partial}(v_p^\lambda).$$

To simplify notation we write $\text{Ker}(\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \oplus \Phi_\lambda) = \text{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_{c,\lambda}$, and similarly for the cokernel.

Lemma 7.7. *If λ is sufficiently small, then the operator $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \oplus \Phi_\lambda$ is a surjective Fredholm operator of index n with kernel isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^n$ via evaluation. Moreover, we get a vector bundle $\text{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_c \subset (0, \lambda_0] \times \mathcal{H}_2(\Delta_0, \mathbb{C}^n) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\underline{\Gamma})$ over $(0, \lambda_0]$ for some λ_0 sufficiently small, with fibers $\text{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_{c,\lambda}$ and with topology induced by the topology on $(0, \lambda_0] \times \mathcal{H}_2(\Delta_0, \mathbb{C}^n) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\underline{\Gamma})$.*

Proof. That the operator is Fredholm of index n follows from Lemma 7.4.

The surjectivity follows by an induction argument. We drop the λ -dependence in what follows. First consider an elementary switch- or Y_1 -piece Γ_1 . By the results in [Ekh07] we have that $\text{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} \simeq \text{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_1} \simeq T_p \Pi(\Sigma)$ via evaluation for λ sufficiently small, where p denotes the switch/ Y_1 -vertex. If we now consider this problem glued to a trivial strip Γ_2 , for which we have $\text{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2} \simeq \text{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_2} \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ via evaluation, it is clear that it is the constant solution taking values in the $(T_p \Pi(\Sigma))^\perp$ -direction that is killed under the gluing. Thus, if we add this constant vector field over the switch/ Y_1 -piece we can extend all kernel elements of Γ_2 over this region and get

$$\text{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\widehat{\Gamma_1 \# \Gamma_2}} \simeq \text{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_{1,c} \simeq \mathbb{R}^n.$$

The same argument works for arbitrary (sub) flow trees Γ with $s(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma) = 1$.

Now assume that the statement is true for trees which satisfy $s(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma) < k$, let Γ be a tree such that $s(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma) = k$. Cut Γ into two trees Γ_1 and Γ_2 so that $s(\Gamma_i) + Y_1(\Gamma_i) \geq 1$, $i = 1, 2$. By induction we have that $\text{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_{i,c} \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$, $\text{Coker} \hat{\Gamma}_{i,c} = 0$, $i = 1, 2$. By using the usual gluing argument we get an exact sequence of stabilized problems

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_c \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_{1,c} \\ \text{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_{2,c} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \text{Coker} \hat{\Gamma}_c \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $\dim \text{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_{i,c} = n$, $i = 1, 2$, and both the kernels are isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^n$ via evaluation, it follows by geometry reasons and exactness of the sequence that $\dim \text{Coker} \hat{\Gamma}_c = 0$ and that $\text{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_c \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ via evaluation.

That we get a vector bundle $\text{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_c$ follows similar to the proof of Proposition 6.9, together with the gluing sequences just described, using Proposition A.3 in the base case of the induction. $\square$

7.3. Virtual kernel elements and splittings. In this somewhat technical section we describe splittings of the spaces $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, $\text{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$, $\text{cap}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda)$. These splittings will then be used to understand how the stabilized version of the capping sequence (6.1) looks like. We will drop the λ -dependence when there is no risk of confusion.

7.3.A. *Notation.* First we introduce some notation. If $\mathcal{H}$ is a Hilbert space and $V \subset \mathcal{H}$ a subspace with orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}$, we let

$$\text{Proj}_V : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow V$$

denote the orthogonal projection $v \mapsto \sum \langle v, e_i \rangle e_i$. In a capping sequence with $V \subset \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma] \oplus \text{cap}(\Gamma) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$ being a finite-dimensional subspace and $W \subset \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$, we let

$$\text{Proj}_V : W \rightarrow V$$

denote the orthogonal projection $v \mapsto \sum \langle v, \phi_{i,\rho} \alpha_i \rangle \phi_i^\rho \alpha_i$ where $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k)$ is a basis for V and ϕ_i^ρ are cut-off functions as in Lemma 5.21.

Also, if $V \subset \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma]$ is a subspace, then

$$\text{Proj}_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma} : V \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma$$

denotes the usual projection in the sense of gluing sequences, i.e., we embed all functions representing V and $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma$ into $\mathcal{H}_1[\hat{\Gamma}]$, using cut-off functions ϕ^ρ , and then project.

If $\Gamma' \supset \Gamma$ is a (sub) flow tree and $V \subset \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma] \oplus \text{cap}(\Gamma) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$ then we also define a map

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma'}} : V &\rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma'} \\ v &\mapsto \text{Proj}_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma'}} \bar{\partial}(\phi_\rho v). \end{aligned}$$

7.3.B. *Splittings of $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$ and virtual kernel elements.* Recall the stabilized operator $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ defined in Section 7.1. Later on, in Section 8, we will prove that when Γ is a sub flow tree then we have a vector bundle $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma}_s$ over $(0, \lambda_0]$ for some λ_0 sufficiently small, with fibers $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s}$. Since $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \subset \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s}$ for each λ , and since we assume that we have a bundle $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma}$, it follows that there is a sub-bundle $\text{VirKer}(\underline{\Gamma}) \subset \text{Ker}(\underline{\Gamma}_s)$ with fibers $\text{VirKer } \Gamma_\lambda$, say, so that

$$\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \oplus \text{VirKer } \Gamma_\lambda = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s},$$

and so that

$$T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \oplus \text{VirKer } \Gamma_\lambda).$$

We call the space $\text{VirKer } \Gamma_\lambda$ the *virtual kernel* of the stabilized problem associated to Γ .

Similarly we let $\text{VirKer}_{\text{pre}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ be the virtual kernel of the pre-stabilized problem associated to Γ , i.e., via evaluation we have that $\text{VirKer}_{\text{pre}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ is the virtual kernel of Γ , minus the flow direction,

$$\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, ps} = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \oplus \text{VirKer}_{\text{pre}}(\Gamma_\lambda).$$

Completely similar to the above this gives rise to a sub-bundle $\text{VirKer}_{\text{pre}}(\underline{\Gamma}) \subset \text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma}_{ps}$.

The following shows that the virtual kernel is complementary to the cokernel in the space of conformal variations.

Lemma 7.8. *For λ sufficiently small there are subspaces*

$$V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma_\lambda), V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma_\lambda) \subset V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$$

satisfying

- (1) $V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma_\lambda) = V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$
- (2) $V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma_\lambda) \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ via $\bar{\partial}$ composed with the projection to $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$
- (3) *There is an isomorphism*

$$(7.14) \quad \Psi_v : V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma_\lambda) \simeq \text{VirKer } \Gamma_\lambda$$

given by L^2 -projection.

Moreover, these spaces give rise to sub-bundles $V_{\text{con},c}(\underline{\Gamma}), V_{\text{con},v}(\underline{\Gamma}) \subset V_{\text{con}}(\underline{\Gamma})$.

Proof. If Γ is a true flow tree then this follows from the definition of $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$ and the fact that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{\lambda,s}}$ in this case is trivial. Otherwise let $\Gamma = \Gamma_1$ and let Γ_2 be such that $\Gamma_1 \# \Gamma_2$ is a rigid flow tree. Denote this tree by Γ' , which then satisfies $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma'_{\lambda,s}} = 0$ and $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma'_{\lambda,s}} \simeq V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_{1,\lambda}) \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_{2,\lambda})$.

We get following the exact gluing sequences, for each λ sufficiently small dropped from the notation,

$$(7.15) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} \\ \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$(7.16) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0.$$

In both sequences the map to $\mathbb{R}^n$ can be thought of as evaluation.

From the second sequence we see that we can choose $\text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1)$ and $\text{VirKer}(\Gamma_2)$ so that

$$\mathbb{R}^n \simeq \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2} \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_2),$$

and this together with the first sequence gives

$$V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2} \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_2).$$

Thus $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1)$ using that $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1}, \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1), V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1)$ can be chosen to have support on the Γ_1 -part of the standard domain corresponding to Γ' .

That the spaces $V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ and $V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ give rise to sub-bundles of $V_{\text{con}}(\underline{\Gamma})$ is proven in Section 9. $\square$

7.3.C. Splittings of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \oplus \text{cap}(\Gamma)$, and isomorphisms. We next describe some splittings of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \oplus \text{cap}(\Gamma)$ which will enable us to keep track of orientations when we stabilize the capping sequences.

Lemma 7.9. *There are sub-bundles*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{kk}(\underline{\Gamma}) &\subset \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \\ \text{cv}(\underline{\Gamma}), \text{ck}(\underline{\Gamma}) &\subset \text{Coker}(\underline{\Gamma}) \\ \mathcal{E}_c(\underline{\Gamma}), \mathcal{E}_k(\underline{\Gamma}) &\subset \mathcal{E}(\underline{\Gamma}), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$(7.17) \quad \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma} \oplus \text{kk}(\underline{\Gamma}) = \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c$$

$$(7.18) \quad \text{ck}(\underline{\Gamma}) \oplus \text{cv}(\underline{\Gamma}) = \text{Coker}(\underline{\Gamma})$$

$$(7.19) \quad \mathcal{E}_c(\underline{\Gamma}) \oplus \mathcal{E}_k(\underline{\Gamma}) = \mathcal{E}(\underline{\Gamma})$$

and so that the fiber-wise defined maps

$$(7.20) \quad \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)} : \text{kk}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)$$

$$(7.21) \quad \psi_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma} : \mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{cv}(\Gamma)$$

$$(7.22) \quad \text{Proj}_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma} : \text{cv}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma$$

give isomorphisms for each λ sufficiently small, dropped from the notation.

Proof. That the sequence is exact follows by similar arguments as in Lemma 5.21 together with Lemma 7.7.

For the splittings of the vector spaces, we notice that we have a canonical embedding $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \subset \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c$ and that $\text{Proj}_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma} : \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma$ is surjective. Hence there are subspaces, for each λ sufficiently small dropped from the notation, $\text{kk}(\Gamma) \subset \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma$, $\text{ck}(\Gamma), \text{cv}(\Gamma) \subset \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma$ so that (7.17), (7.18) and (7.22) hold.

Now the two sequences (7.27) and (7.31) imply that we can find $\mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)$ satisfying (7.19), (7.20) and (7.22) pointwise. Moreover, by the constructions in the proofs in Section 9 it follows that all these subspaces can be chosen continuously in λ . $\square$

Lemma 7.10. *There is a sub-bundle $\text{cap}_c(\underline{\Gamma}) \subset \mathcal{E}(\underline{\Gamma}) \oplus \text{cap}(\underline{\Gamma})$ with fibers $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda)$, so that*

$$\psi_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}} : \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$$

is an isomorphism. Moreover, $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda)$ can be chosen so that if $\Gamma' \supseteq \Gamma$ is a (sub) flow tree then

$$(7.23) \quad \psi_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma'_\lambda}}(V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma_\lambda)) = \psi_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma'_\lambda}}(\text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda)).$$

If $\Gamma' = \Gamma$ then this induces an isomorphism

$$(7.24) \quad \psi_c : V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda).$$

Lemma 7.11. *Let Γ be a sub flow tree with special puncture p . Then there are sub-bundles $\text{cap}_v(\underline{\Gamma}) \subset \mathcal{E}(\underline{\Gamma}) \oplus \text{cap}(\underline{\Gamma})$ and $\text{kv}(\underline{\Gamma}) \subset \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c$ so that*

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(\text{kv}(\Gamma_\lambda)) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(\text{VirKer}(\Gamma_\lambda))$$

and so that

$$\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \text{cap}(\Gamma_\lambda)} : \text{kv}(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_\lambda)$$

is an isomorphism. Moreover, $\text{cap}_v(\Gamma_\lambda)$ can be chosen so that if $\Gamma' \supseteq \Gamma$ is a (sub) flow tree then

$$\psi_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma'}}(\text{cap}_v(\Gamma_\lambda)) = \psi_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma'}}(V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma_\lambda)) = \psi_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma'}}(\text{VirKer}(\Gamma_\lambda)).$$

Lemma 7.12. *Let Γ be either a rigid flow tree or a sub flow tree, and let p be either the positive puncture or the special puncture of Γ . Then there are sub-bundles $\text{cap}_k(\underline{\Gamma}) \subset \mathcal{E}(\underline{\Gamma}) \oplus \text{cap}(\underline{\Gamma})$ and $\widehat{\text{cap}}_k(\underline{\Gamma}) \subset \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c$ so that*

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(\widehat{\text{cap}}_k(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{s,\lambda}}) = \mathbb{R}^n$$

and so that

$$\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \text{cap}(\Gamma_\lambda)}(\widehat{\text{cap}}_k(\Gamma_\lambda)) = \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_\lambda)$$

is an isomorphism. Moreover

$$(7.25) \quad \psi_k := \text{Proj}_{\text{cap}_k(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{s,\lambda}}} : \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_{c,\lambda} \rightarrow \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{s,\lambda}}$$

is an isomorphism, and we also have that

$$(7.26) \quad \text{cap}_c(\underline{\Gamma}) \oplus \text{cap}_v(\underline{\Gamma}) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\underline{\Gamma}) = \mathcal{E}(\underline{\Gamma}) \oplus \text{cap}(\underline{\Gamma}).$$

Here $\text{cap}_v(\underline{\Gamma})$ is empty if Γ is a rigid flow tree.

We refer to Section 9 for proofs of lemmas 7.10 – 7.12.

Remark 7.13. All this also hold with the stabilized problem replaced by the pre-stabilized problem, giving a space $\text{cap}_{v,\text{pre}}(\Gamma)$ instead of the space $\text{cap}_v(\Gamma)$.

7.4. Stabilized capping orientation. Let Γ be a (sub) flow tree of Λ , and recall the capping sequence (6.1) of Γ defined in Section 6. In this section we will examine how the stabilizations of the $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ - and $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ -operators, defined in Sections 7.1 and 7.2, respectively, affect this sequence.

First, using the splitting (7.1) and the notation $\text{cap}(\Gamma_A) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{q}_{i,-}} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{q}_{0,+}}$, where $q_0, \dots, q_m$ are the punctures of Γ and λ is dropped from the notation, we rewrite the capping sequence (6.1) on the form

$$(7.27) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \begin{bmatrix} \text{cap}_A(\Gamma) \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma} \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\beta} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma} \xrightarrow{\gamma} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Recall from Section 6.2 that we can think of this sequence as a sequence of vector bundles.

If we now stabilize the operators $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}$ by adding the spaces $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$, respectively, to their domains, then the stabilized version of (7.27) can be interpreted as the sequence

$$(7.28) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \\ V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma) \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{(\psi_k, \psi_c, \psi_v)} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \\ \text{cap}_A(\Gamma) \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_s} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0,$$

where the maps ψ_k, ψ_c, ψ_v are given by the formulas (7.25), (7.24) and (7.14), respectively. We extend ψ_k to the auxiliary directions by putting $\psi_k|_{\text{Aux } \Gamma} = \alpha|_{\text{Aux } \Gamma}$, and we notice that the sequence (7.28) is exact. This will be the *stabilized capping sequence* of Γ .

Fix orientations of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}$, $\text{Aux } \Gamma$ and $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}$ so that the orientation pair $(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma, \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}})$ represents the canonical orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}$. Also, give $\text{cap}_A(\Gamma)$ its fixed orientation described in Section 5.4, give $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$ its standard orientation, regarding marked points as punctures, (thus not as described in equation (6.9)), and give $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ the orientation described in Section 7.2. Let $\text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma$ be given the stabilized orientation from the stabilization by $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$. See Section 5.2.B. These choices, together with the sequence (7.28) and the orientation convention (5.2) induces an orientation on $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_s}$, which will be the *stabilized orientation* of Γ .

If we use the constructions in Section 5.2.B, we see that an orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}$ induces an orientation of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_s}$, and vice versa. That is, we have an exact sequence

$$(7.29) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} & \rightarrow & \text{Ker}(\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s}) & \rightarrow & V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \rightarrow 0 \\ & & v & \mapsto & (v, 0) & & \\ & & & & (v, w) & \mapsto & w \\ & & & & & & w \mapsto \psi_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}}(w). \end{array}$$

Now recall the exact sequence (5.18) and the maps η and Ψ_κ , defined in Section 7.1 and Section 5.2.C, respectively. It follows that we get a commuting diagram

$$(7.30) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker}(\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \oplus \Psi_\kappa) & \longrightarrow & T_\kappa \mathcal{C}_{m+1} \longrightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow (\text{id}, \eta) & & \downarrow \eta \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker}(\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s}) & \longrightarrow & V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda) \longrightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

This implies that if we understand the difference between the stabilized orientation of Γ_λ and the capping orientation of Γ , then we can use the stabilized orientation to give an orientation to the fully linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator at w_λ .

Proposition 7.14. *Let $\mathcal{O}_{\text{cap}}(\Gamma)$ denote the capping orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ and let $\mathcal{O}_s(\Gamma)$ denote the orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ induced by the stabilized capping orientation of Γ_λ via the sequence (7.29). Then*

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{cap}}(\Gamma) = (-1)^\nu \mathcal{O}_s(\Gamma),$$

where

$$\nu = (n + e(\Gamma))(n + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}) + \dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}.$$

Remark 7.15. With abuse of notation, we will call the orientation $\mathcal{O}_s(\Gamma)$ the stabilized capping orientation of Γ . That this definition is independent of λ for λ sufficiently small will be proved in Section 8.

Proof. Assume that λ is sufficiently small, and drop it from the notation.

Consider the sequence (7.27). We start by stabilizing it by the space $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$. It follows from Lemma 7.9 that this stabilization together with the exact sequence (7.27) induces

a sequence

$$(7.31) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\alpha}_\rho} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \\ \text{cap}_A(\Gamma) \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\beta}_\rho} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

where

$$\tilde{\alpha}_\rho(v) = \begin{cases} (\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)}(v), \text{Proj}_{\text{cap}(\Gamma)}(v), \text{Proj}_{\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma}(v)) & v \in \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \\ \alpha_\rho(v) & v \in \text{Aux } \Gamma \end{cases}$$

and

$$\tilde{\beta}_\rho(v_1, v_2, v_3) = \psi_{\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma}(v_1 + v_2 + v_3)$$

following the notation introduced in Section 7.3. Moreover, again by Lemma 7.9, it follows that this sequence is exact, and that we can rewrite it as

$$(7.32) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \\ \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\check{\alpha}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma) \\ \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) \\ \text{cap}_A(\Gamma) \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\check{\beta}} \begin{bmatrix} \text{cv}(\Gamma) \\ \text{ck}(\Gamma) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \check{\alpha}|_{\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)} &= (0, \text{id}, 0, 0) \\ \check{\alpha}|_{\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma} &= (0, 0, \alpha, \alpha) \\ \check{\beta}|_{\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)} &= 0 \\ \check{\beta}|_{\mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma)} &= (\text{id}, 0) \\ \check{\beta}|_{\text{cap}_A(\Gamma) \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma} &= (0, \beta). \end{aligned}$$

We see that the orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ induced by this sequence differs from the orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ induced by the sequence (7.31) by a factor $(-1)^{\sigma_1}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1 &= \dim \mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma)(\dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) + \dim \text{cap}_A(\Gamma) + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma + \dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma + \dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}) \\ &\quad + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)(\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma) \\ &= (n + e(\Gamma))(n + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}) + \dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to stabilize the problem by adding the space $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$ to the domain of the $\bar{\partial}_\Gamma$ - and the $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}$ -operator, to obtain the sequence (7.28). From the nature of the mappings ψ_k, ψ_c , and ψ_v , together with the orientation convention (5.2), it follows that the orientation induced by $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_s}$ from this sequence equals the orientation of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_s}$ induced from the exact sequence (7.29) if $\det \bar{\partial}_\Gamma$ is given the orientation from the sequence (7.31). Indeed, using the splitting (7.26) we see that if we neglect the auxiliary directions then the sequence (7.31) can be written as

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{cap}_c(\Gamma) \\ \text{cap}_v(\Gamma) \\ \text{cap}_k(\Gamma) \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

where $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma) \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma$ under the rightmost non-trivial map. Using our orientation conventions we see that this induces the orientation

$$(-1)^{n \cdot \dim \text{cap}_c(\Gamma)} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c = \text{cap}_v(\Gamma) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma) \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma$$

on the remaining spaces. We compare this with the orientation induced by the sequence (7.28). If we again neglect the auxiliary directions, and use the splittings $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma) = V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma) \oplus V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma)$, $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_s} = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma)$ we can write this sequence like

$$0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \\ V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma) \\ V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma) \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\Psi} \begin{bmatrix} \text{cap}_c(\Gamma) \\ \text{cap}_v(\Gamma) \\ \text{cap}_k(\Gamma) \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \\ \text{VirKer}(\Gamma) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0,$$

where Ψ maps $V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma)$ isomorphically onto $\text{VirKer}(\Gamma)$, and $V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma)$ isomorphically onto $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma)$. Hence the remaining spaces get the induced orientation

$$(-1)^{n \cdot \dim V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma)} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c = \text{cap}_v(\Gamma) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma) \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma.$$

The claim follows. $\square$

Next we consider the pre-stabilized case. In this situation we have an exact sequence

$$(7.33) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \\ V_{\text{con},\text{pre}}(\Gamma) \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}_c, \tilde{\psi}_v, \tilde{\psi}_k} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \\ \text{cap}_A(\Gamma) \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps}} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

where $\tilde{\psi}_c, \tilde{\psi}_v, \tilde{\psi}_k$ is defined similarly to the stabilized case, and where $V_{\text{con},\text{pre}}(\Gamma)$ is oriented by $(v_1, \dots, \hat{v}_j, \dots, v_{m-1})$. Here v_j is the conformal variation that has to be added to $V_{\text{con},\text{pre}}(\Gamma)$ to get $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$. Give $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{\lambda,ps}}$ the orientation induced by this sequence, and define the *pre-stabilized capping orientation* of Γ to be the orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_\Gamma$ induced by the exact sequence

$$(7.34) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{\lambda,ps}} \rightarrow V_{\text{con},\text{pre}}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \rightarrow 0$$

with maps given similar to the stabilized case.

Let $V_{\text{con},v,n}(\Gamma) = \text{Span}(v_j)$, and notice the following.

Lemma 7.16. *Let Γ be a sub flow tree. Then the pre-stabilized capping orientation of Γ equals the stabilized capping orientation, times $(-1)^{1+\sigma}$. Here σ satisfies*

$$V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma) = (-1)^\sigma V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma) \oplus V_{\text{con},v,\text{pre}}(\Gamma) \oplus V_{\text{con},v,n}(\Gamma)$$

oriented, where $V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma) \oplus V_{\text{con},v,\text{pre}}(\Gamma) = V_{\text{con},\text{pre}}(\Gamma)$ as oriented vector spaces.

Proof. Follows by straightforward calculations. $\square$

7.5. The stabilized gluing sign. Now we are prepared to do the most important gluing, namely the one when we glue together two partial sub flow trees Γ_1 and Γ_2 , to get a tree $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \# \Gamma_2$ together with an exact gluing sequence

$$(7.35) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{\lambda,ps}} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{\lambda,1,s}} \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{\lambda,2,s}} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0.$$

We will calculate the difference between the orientation of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps}}$ induced by this sequence, given that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{i,s}}$ is oriented by (7.28), $i = 1, 2$, and the orientation of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps}}$ induced by the sequence (7.33). The sign we get from this comparison will be used repeatedly when we prove that the orientation algorithm in Section 3 gives the capping orientation of Γ .

To that end, we assume that Γ_1 is either an elementary tree or a sub flow tree, and that Γ_2 is either an elementary tree or a sub flow tree glued to a Y_0 - or Y_1 -piece. Also, we assume that the trees are numbered in such a way so that the positive puncture of Γ coincides with the positive puncture of Γ_2 , and so that $V_{\text{con,pre}}(\Gamma) = V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2)$, oriented. This means that the capping operators of Γ are ordered as $\text{cap}(\Gamma) = \text{cap}(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{cap}(\Gamma_2)$, except in the case when we are gluing a tree Γ_1 to a negative 2-piece Γ_2 of type 1, where we have $\text{cap}(\Gamma) = \text{cap}(\Gamma_2) \oplus \text{cap}(\Gamma_1)$. In all cases above we get that the cusp-stabilization spaces are oriented as $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)$.

Proposition 7.17. *Let $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{\lambda,i,s}}$, $i = 1, 2$, be given the orientation induced by the stabilized capping sequence (7.28), $i = 1, 2$, and assume that $(v_\lambda^1, \dots, v_\lambda^m)$ represents the orientation of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{\lambda,ps}}$ induced by the gluing sequence (7.35). Then the pre-stabilized capping orientation of Γ_λ is given by $(-1)^\sigma v_\lambda^1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_\lambda^m$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma = & (\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma_1) \cdot (n + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2} + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma_2) \\ & + n \cdot \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma_2 \cdot \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \\ & + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \cdot \dim \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_2) + \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2) \cdot (\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} + \dim \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_1)) \\ & + \eta(\Gamma_2) \cdot n \cdot \dim \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_2), \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta(\Gamma_2) = 1$ if Γ_2 is a 2-piece of type 1, and $\eta(\Gamma_2) = 0$ otherwise.

Definition 7.18. We will denote σ the *gluing sign*.

Before giving a proof of this proposition, we need some additional results to be able to use the observations from Section 5.2.B concerning signs coming from gluing of stabilized exact sequences. Indeed, we will consider the stabilization of the gluing sequence

$$(7.36) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_1} \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma_1 \end{array} \right) \\ \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_2} \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma_2 \end{array} \right) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \\ \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_2} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \rightarrow 0,$$

stabilized by the space $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$. Notice that this sequence gives inclusions $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \subset \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_i}$, $i = 1, 2$. We have the following.

Lemma 7.19. *In the situation of gluing described above, let p be a special puncture of Γ . Then there are subbundles $\underline{C}_i \subset \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and $\underline{C} \subset \text{Coker } \hat{\Gamma}$, with fibers $C_{1,\lambda}, C_{2,\lambda}, C_\lambda$, respectively, so that*

$$(7.37) \quad \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_{1,\lambda}} = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \oplus C_{1,\lambda}$$

$$(7.38) \quad \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_{2,\lambda}} = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \oplus C_{2,\lambda}$$

and so that

$$(7.39) \quad \mathbb{R}^n = \text{ev}_p(C_{2,\lambda} \oplus C_\lambda \oplus C_{1,\lambda} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}).$$

In addition,

$$(7.40) \quad \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_{1,\lambda}) \simeq C_{2,\lambda} \oplus C_\lambda$$

$$(7.41) \quad \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_{2,\lambda}) \simeq C_{1,\lambda} \oplus C_\lambda$$

$$(7.42) \quad \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_\lambda) \simeq C_{2,\lambda} \oplus C_\lambda \oplus C_{1,\lambda} \simeq \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_{1,\lambda}) \oplus C_{1,\lambda}$$

given by evaluation at p , where we have used the identifications $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_{i,\lambda}) \simeq \text{kk}(\Gamma_{i,\lambda})$, $i = 1, 2$, $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_\lambda) \simeq \text{kk}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, coming from Lemma 7.9.

Proof. Consider the exact sequence (7.36). Since we have put marked points at all end-vertices, we may assume that the middle arrow only hits $\mathbb{R}^n \oplus \text{Aux}_1 \oplus \text{Aux}_2$. Thus there are subspaces $C_{i,\lambda} \subset \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_{i,\lambda}}$, $i = 1, 2$, and $C_\lambda \subset \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ for all λ sufficiently small, so that (7.37), (7.38) and (7.39) hold. We also note that $\text{ev}_p : C_{2,\lambda} \oplus C_\lambda \oplus C_{1,\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is injective.

By arguments similar to those in Proposition 6.9 the leftmost non-trivial map in the sequence (7.36) lifts to a bundle map $\underline{\psi} : \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma} \rightarrow \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_1 \oplus \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_2$, and it follows that the spaces $C_{i,\lambda}$, C_λ give rise to sub-bundles as stated.

Thus, if we drop the auxiliary directions, we can write the sequence (7.36) as a bundle-sequence of the following form

$$(7.43) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma} \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma} \\ \underline{C}_1 \\ \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma} \\ \underline{C}_2 \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma_1) \\ \underline{C}_2 \\ \underline{C} \\ \underline{C}_1 \\ \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma} \\ \mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma_2) \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} \underline{C} \\ \mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma_1) \\ \mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma_2) \end{array} \right] \rightarrow 0.$$

But from this we get the identifications (7.40), (7.41) and (7.42), using that $\text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ via evaluation, together with the identifications in Lemma 7.9. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 7.17. Consider the pre-stabilized capping sequence (7.33) of Γ , which in this case can be written as

$$(7.44) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \\ V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \\ V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1) \\ \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2) \\ \text{cap}_A(\Gamma) \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps}} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0,$$

and recall that $\text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma$ is given the stabilized orientation, coming from the canonical orientation of $(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma, \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}})$ and the fixed orientation of $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)$. By the lemmas 5.13, 5.14 and 7.19, if $(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_i} \oplus \text{Aux}(\Gamma_i), \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_i})$, $i = 1, 2$, are given their corresponding stabilized orientation, then the gluing sequence

$$(7.45) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_{1,c} \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right) \\ \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_{2,c} \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

induces the stabilized orientation of $\text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma$ times $(-1)^{\sigma_0}$, where

$$\sigma_0 = (\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_1} + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma_1)(n + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_2} + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma_2).$$

If we now stabilize the sequence (7.45) by adding the space $V_{\text{con,pre}}(\Gamma) = V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2)$ to the first and second column, and define the maps between these spaces to be given by the identity, we get the sequence

$$(7.46) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \\ V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \\ V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_{1,c} \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma_1 \\ V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \end{smallmatrix} \right) \\ \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_{2,c} \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma_2 \\ V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) \end{smallmatrix} \right) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0.$$

If we think of this stabilization as done by adding the spaces to the top of the rows, and then moving them, we see that this sequence induces the same orientation on $\text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma$ as the sequence (7.45) does, times $(-1)^{\sigma_1}$, where

$$\sigma_1 = n \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma_2 \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1).$$

Now if we consider the stabilized capping sequence sequence (7.28) for Γ_i , $i = 1, 2$, and use Lemma 5.23, we get that the sequence

$$(7.47) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \\ V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \\ V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1) \\ \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_1) \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \end{smallmatrix} \right) \\ \left(\begin{smallmatrix} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2) \\ \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_2) \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} \end{smallmatrix} \right) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

induces the same orientation on $\text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma$ as the sequence (7.46) does. This if we assume that $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_i) \oplus \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_i)$ is given its fixed orientation, and that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{i,s}}$ is given the stabilized capping orientation, $i = 1, 2$.

Next we move $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2) \oplus \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_2)$ over $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}}$, and $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)$ over $\text{cap}_A(\Gamma_1)$. This costs a sign $(-1)^{\sigma_2}$,

$$\sigma_2 = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \dim \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_2) + \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)(\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} + \dim \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_1)),$$

and gives us the exact sequence

$$(7.48) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \\ \text{Aux } \Gamma \\ V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \\ V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1) \\ \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2) \\ \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_1) \\ \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_2) \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0.$$

Now let $\text{cap}_A(\Gamma|_{\Gamma_i})$ denote the capping kernels of $\text{cap}_A(\Gamma)$ on the part of Γ corresponding to Γ_i , $i = 1, 2$, and let p denote the special puncture we are gluing at. Then we have that

$$\text{cap}_A(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_2) = \text{cap}_A(\Gamma|_{\Gamma_1}) \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}+} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}-} \oplus \text{cap}_A(\Gamma|_{\Gamma_2})$$

where

$$\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}+} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}-} = \begin{cases} (\text{Aux}_1, \text{Aux}_2) \oplus (0, 0) & p \text{ irreversible} \\ (0, \text{Aux}_2) \oplus (\text{Aux}_1, 0) & p \text{ reversible} \end{cases}$$

This implies that we can move the space $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}+} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}-}$ to the bottom of sequence (7.48), without compensating with any signs. Then we cancel this space with the gluing cokernel in the auxiliary directions, noting that the vectors in $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}+}$ is mapped by $-\text{id}$ to the gluing cokernel, while the vectors in $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}-}$ is mapped by id .

Next we use Lemma 5.23 together with the gluing sequence (7.35) to replace the remaining $\mathbb{R}^n$ -factor in the gluing cokernel and the space $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}}$ in the second non-trivial column by the space $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps}}$. That is, we get that the sequence (7.48) induces the same orientation on $\text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_c \oplus \text{Aux } \Gamma$ as the sequence (7.44) does, given that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps}}$ is given the orientation from the gluing sequence (7.35).

Summing up, we see that the gluing sequence (7.35) induces the pre-stabilized orientation of Γ , times the sign $(-1)^\sigma$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= \sigma_0 + \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \\ &= (\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_1} + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma_1)(n + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_2} + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma_2) \\ &\quad + n \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma_2 \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \\ &\quad + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \dim \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_2) + \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)(\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} + \dim \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_1)). \end{aligned}$$

If p is a 2-valent puncture of type 1 we have to multiply by the sign $(-1)^{n \dim \text{cap}_A(\Gamma_2)}$ to get the correct order of the capping operators in the sequence (7.44). $\square$

Remark 7.20. Using the exact sequence (7.27) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} n + e(\Gamma) &\equiv \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} + \dim \operatorname{Aux} \Gamma + \dim \operatorname{Coker} \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \\ &\equiv \dim \operatorname{cap}_A(\Gamma) + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma} + \dim \operatorname{Coker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma} \\ &\equiv \dim \operatorname{cap}_A(\Gamma) + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_s} + \dim V_{\operatorname{con}}(\Gamma) \pmod{2}, \end{aligned}$$

and by the definition of the capping operators in the auxiliary directions we have

$$\dim \operatorname{Aux} \Gamma \equiv c(\Gamma) \pmod{2}$$

where $c(\Gamma) = e(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma) + s(\Gamma)$. Hence we can rewrite the gluing sign σ in Proposition 7.17 as

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma &= e(\Gamma_2)(n + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + c(\Gamma_1) + \dim V_{\operatorname{con}}(\Gamma_1)) \\ &\quad + \dim V_{\operatorname{con}}(\Gamma_2)(n + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}}) + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}}(n + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} + e(\Gamma_2)) \\ &\quad + (s(\Gamma_2) + Y_1(\Gamma_2))(n + e(\Gamma_1)) + \eta \cdot n(n + e(\Gamma_1) + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} + \dim V_{\operatorname{con}}(\Gamma_1)). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 7.21. Fix orientations of $\operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}$, $\operatorname{Aux} \Gamma$ and $\operatorname{Coker} \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}$, representing the canonical orientation. Also, give $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \simeq \mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma) \oplus \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)$ the orientation described in Section 7.2, orient $\mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma)$ via the identification $\mathcal{E}_c(\Gamma) \simeq \operatorname{Coker} \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}$, and give $\mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)$ the induced orientation. Give $\operatorname{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_c$ the induced orientation from the stabilized orientation of $\operatorname{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_c \oplus \operatorname{Aux} \Gamma$. Then we have that

$$\operatorname{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_c = (-1)^{\dim \operatorname{Aux} \Gamma} \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} \oplus \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma).$$

Moreover, recall that $\operatorname{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_c \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ (unoriented) via evaluation, and hence there is a $\nu(\Gamma) \in \{0, 1\}$ so that

$$(7.49) \quad (-1)^{\nu(\Gamma)} \bigwedge^{\max} \mathbb{R}^n = \bigwedge^{\max} \operatorname{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_c.$$

From the proof of Proposition 7.17 we have the following corollary.

Corollary 7.22. *If we assume that $\operatorname{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_{i,c} \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ as oriented vector spaces via evaluation, $i = 1, 2$, then*

$$\operatorname{Ker} \hat{\Gamma}_c \simeq (-1)^{n \cdot \dim \operatorname{Aux} \Gamma_2} \mathbb{R}^n.$$

8. STABILIZED CAPPING ORIENTATION IN THE LIMIT

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. In particular, we prove that we can pass to the limit $\lambda = 0$ in the gluing sequence (7.35) and understand the orientation of the trees as oriented subspaces in M via evaluation, as stated in Section 3.

In Subsection 8.1 we prove that the stabilized kernel of a sub flow tree Γ satisfies similar bundle properties as the un-stabilized kernel does, and that the gluing sequence (7.35) can be understood as an exact sequence of subspaces in $T_p M$, where p is the puncture we are gluing at. In Subsection 8.2 we prove that the orientations of vertices defined in Section 3.3 coincide with the capping orientation of the corresponding elementary tree. We also prove the base case for our inductive assumptions about bundles, namely that the kernels of the $\bar{\partial}$ -operators corresponding to elementary trees

give oriented vector bundles over $(0, \lambda_0]$ for λ_0 sufficiently small, where the orientations of the fibers coincide with the capping orientation. This uses results from Appendix A.

In Subsection 8.3 and Subsection 8.4 we prove that the orientation of a (sub) flow tree Γ , as defined in Section 3.4 and Section 3.5, coincides with the capping orientation of the pre-glued disk w_λ of Γ . In particular, it follows that the capping orientation of w_λ is independent of λ for λ sufficiently small. We conclude this section by proving that the capping orientation of the pre-glued disk w_λ equals the capping orientation of the true J -holomorphic disk corresponding to Γ for λ sufficiently small. This is done in Subsection 8.5.

8.1. Stabilized gluing sequences in the limit. Recall that if p is a special puncture of a sub flow tree Γ , then we have a well-defined evaluation map $\text{ev}_p : \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s} \rightarrow T_p M$ for all λ sufficiently small, so that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s}) = T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma)$ where $\mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma)$ denotes the flow-out of Γ at p . See Section 2.3 and Lemma 7.3.

Remark 8.1. Note that the evaluation map in fact takes value in planes $\Theta_\lambda(p)\mathbb{R}^n$, but by the limiting process $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ we can canonically identify it with $T_p M$.

Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be two partial flow trees satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 7.17 and assume that $\text{ev}_p : \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{i,s,\lambda}} \rightarrow T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_i)$ is an isomorphism in the limit, $i = 1, 2$. Here p is the point at which Γ_1 and Γ_2 are glued. For example, this holds if the trees are sub flow trees or elementary pieces. We will show that the gluing sequence (7.35) can be understood as an exact sequence of subspaces in $T_p M$. We make the following definition.

Definition 8.2. The *stabilized gluing sequence in the limit* is given by

$$(8.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \rightarrow & T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_1) \cap T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_2) & \rightarrow & \begin{bmatrix} T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_1) \\ T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_2) \end{bmatrix} & \rightarrow & T_p M \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \\ & & v & \mapsto & \begin{pmatrix} (v, v) \\ (u, w) \end{pmatrix} & \mapsto & w - u. \end{array}$$

Let now Γ be a sub flow tree or an elementary tree, and let p be a special puncture of Γ . Similar to Section 6.2, we will prove that the kernels of the stabilized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator associated to Γ give rise to a vector bundle over $(0, \lambda_0]$ for λ_0 sufficiently small, with fibers $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda, s}$. We will compactify these bundles to be bundles over $[0, \lambda_0]$, by adding the space $T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma)$ as fiber over $\lambda = 0$, so that we get a vector bundle

$$(8.2) \quad \pi_{\Gamma_s} : \text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma}_s \rightarrow [0, \lambda_0]$$

with fibers

$$\pi_{\Gamma_s}^{-1}(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{s,\lambda}}, & \lambda > 0 \\ T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma), & \lambda = 0. \end{cases}$$

To define the topology of $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma}_s$, recall the pseudo-metric d_b defined by the formula (6.6). Let $d_{V_{\text{con}}}$ be the direct sum-metric on $V_{\text{con}}(\underline{\Gamma})$ under the identification $V_{\text{con}}(\underline{\Gamma}) \simeq$

$(0, \lambda_0] \times \mathbb{R}^{m-2}$, described in Section 7.1. Define a metric $\tilde{d}$ on $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma}_s$ by

$$(8.3) \quad \tilde{d}(v_{\lambda_1}, v_{\lambda_2})^2 = d_b \left(\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}(\Gamma)}(v_{\lambda_1}), \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}(\Gamma)}(v_{\lambda_2}) \right)^2 \\ + d_{V_{\text{con}}} \left(\text{Proj}_{V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)}(v_{\lambda_1}), \text{Proj}_{V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)}(v_{\lambda_2}) \right)^2 + |\text{ev}_p(v_{\lambda_1}) - \text{ev}_p(v_{\lambda_2})|^2$$

for $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$, and by

$$(8.4) \quad \tilde{d}(v_{\lambda_1}, v_{\lambda_2})^2 = \begin{cases} |\text{ev}_p(v_{\lambda_1}) - v_{\lambda_2}|^2 + \lambda_1^2, & \lambda_1 > \lambda_2 = 0 \\ |v_{\lambda_1} - v_{\lambda_2}|^2, & \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0, \end{cases}$$

and give $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma}_s$ the topology induced by this metric.

The following proposition is similar to Proposition 6.9.

Proposition 8.3. *Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be two partial flow trees satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 7.17. Also assume that they satisfy the following.*

- (1) *There is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that we have vector bundles $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma}_{i,s}$, $i = 1, 2$, given by equation (8.2) and with topology given by (8.3) and (8.4).*
- (2) *We can define an orientation of $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma}_{i,s}$ so that the orientation of each fiber gives the stabilized capping orientation of Γ_i , $i = 1, 2$.*

Then there is a $\lambda'_0 > 0$ so that (1) and (2) also hold for the glued tree Γ , with the stabilized kernel replaced by the pre-stabilized kernel.

Moreover, suppose that $\mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_i)$ is given the stabilized capping orientation of the tree Γ_i , $i = 1, 2$, and suppose that $(v_1, \dots, v_k)$ gives an oriented basis for $T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_1) \cap T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_2)$, where the orientation is induced by the sequence (8.1). Let

$$\xi : \text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma}_{ps} \rightarrow [0, \lambda_0] \times T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_1) \cap T_p \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_2)$$

be the induced bundle-trivialization from statement (1), and let $v_i^\lambda = \xi_\lambda^{-1}(v_i)$. Then the pre-stabilized capping orientation of Γ is given by

$$\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps,\lambda}} = (-1)^\sigma \text{Span}(v_1^\lambda, \dots, v_k^\lambda)$$

where σ is the gluing sign in Proposition 7.17.

Definition 8.4. We call the bundle $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma}_s$ the *stabilized kernel bundle* of Γ .

Proof. The proof of the first two statements are similar to the proof of Proposition 6.9. In particular, we can find a basis $(v_1^\lambda, \dots, v_k^\lambda)$ of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps,\lambda}}$ satisfying

$$v_i^\lambda = \phi_1^\lambda w_i^\lambda + \phi_2^\lambda u_i^\lambda + r_i^\lambda$$

where $w_i^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s,\lambda}}$, $u_i^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s,\lambda}}$ are continuous families of vectors satisfying $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(w_i^\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(u_i^\lambda)$, and $r_i^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ satisfies $\|r_i^\lambda\|_{W,\lambda} = O(\lambda)$. Here $\|\cdot\|_{W,\lambda}$ denotes the norm on $\mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, and ϕ_k^λ , $k = 1, 2$, are the cut-off functions from the proof of Proposition 6.9, where we have replaced A by 1 and B by 2. Moreover, we assume that we have a trivialization of $T_p M$ so that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(v_i^\lambda) = \partial_{x_i}, \quad T_p(\mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_1) \cap \mathcal{F}_p(\Gamma_2)) = \text{Span}(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_k}).$$

To prove that the gluing sequence can be evaluated in the limit, we complete the bases $(w_1^\lambda, \dots, w_k^\lambda)$ and $(u_1^\lambda, \dots, u_k^\lambda)$ to bases $(w_1^\lambda, \dots, w_{k_1}^\lambda)$ and $(u_1^\lambda, \dots, u_{k_2}^\lambda)$ of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s,\lambda}}$ and $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s,\lambda}}$, respectively. By the constructions in [[Ekh07], Proposition 6.20] we may moreover assume that the vectors are chosen so that

$$\begin{aligned} w_i^\lambda &= \partial_{x_i} + O(\lambda), & i &= 1, \dots, k_1, \\ u_i^\lambda &= \partial_{x_i} + O(\lambda), & i &= 1, \dots, k, \\ u_i^\lambda &= \partial_{x_{k_1+i}} + O(\lambda), & i &= k+1, \dots, k_2, \end{aligned}$$

in the gluing region. Here $O(\lambda)$ means a vector of norm $O(\lambda)$.

Following the arguments in the proof of Proposition 6.9, we see that to prove that the left-most, non-trivial map in the gluing sequence behaves as stated in the limit we must show that

$$\left| \int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle v_i^{\lambda_n}, \phi_1^{\lambda_n} w_j^{\lambda_n} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm - \delta_i^j \right| \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\left| \int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle v_i^{\lambda_n}, \phi_2^{\lambda_n} u_j^{\lambda_n} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm - \delta_i^j \right| \rightarrow 0$$

as $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, $j = 1, \dots, n$. Here we have used bundle-trivializations given by the bases $\underline{v}^\lambda$, $\underline{w}^\lambda$ and $\underline{u}^\lambda$, respectively. We prove that this holds for the first integral, the second one is completely similar.

We get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle v_i^{\lambda_n}, \phi_1^{\lambda_n} w_j^{\lambda_n} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm - \delta_i^j \right| \\ & \leq \left| \int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle \phi_1^{\lambda_n} w_i^{\lambda_n}, \phi_1^{\lambda_n} w_j^{\lambda_n} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm - \delta_i^j \right| + \left| \int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle r_i^{\lambda_n}, \phi_1^{\lambda_n} w_j^{\lambda_n} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm \right| \\ & \quad + \left| \int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle \phi_2^{\lambda_n} u_i^{\lambda_n}, \phi_1^{\lambda_n} w_j^{\lambda_n} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm \right| \\ & \leq |\delta_i^j - \delta_i^j| + \|r_i^{\lambda_n}\|_{\mu, \lambda_n} \|\phi_1^{\lambda_n} w_j^{\lambda_n}\|_{\mu, \lambda_n} + O(\lambda) = O(\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

since the cut-off functions ϕ_1^λ and ϕ_2^λ are assumed to have disjoint support for all λ . Hence the leftmost map behaves as claimed.

To prove that the second map also behaves as claimed in the limit, we must consider the integrals

$$\int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle \bar{\partial}(\phi_1^{\lambda_n} w_i^{\lambda_n}), \psi_{\lambda_n} \partial_{x_j} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle \bar{\partial}(\phi_2^{\lambda_n} u_i^{\lambda_n}), \psi_{\lambda_n} \partial_{x_j} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm,$$

$i, j = 1, \dots, n$, respectively, where ψ_{λ_n} is a cut-off function having support in the gluing region, compare [[EES05b], Lemma 3.1]. But by the choice of the basis vectors the integrals can be understood, up to $O(\lambda)$, as

$$\int_{\Delta(\lambda_n)} \langle \bar{\partial}(\phi_k^{\lambda_n}) \partial_{x_i}^{\lambda_n}, \psi_{\lambda_n} \partial_{x_j} \rangle \mathbf{w}^2 dm = \begin{cases} -c_{\lambda_n} \delta_i^j, & k = 1 \\ c_{\lambda_n} \delta_i^j, & k = 2 \end{cases}$$

where c_{λ_n} is some non-negative constant uniformly bounded from below. The sign comes from the derivative of the cut-off function, compare [[EES05b], Lemma 3.11].

This proves the proposition. $\square$

8.2. Capping orientation of elementary pieces. In this subsection we prove that the orientations of vertices described in Section 3.3 are well-defined and coincide with the capping orientation of the corresponding elementary pieces, as defined in Section 6.2.

We begin by proving that the orientations assigned to the capping operators in Section 5.4.D are well-defined. With this established we can show that the formulas in the definitions 3.3 – 3.10 give the capping orientations of the corresponding elementary pieces. At the same time we prove the base case of the inductive assumptions in Proposition 6.9 and Proposition 8.3, that is, we prove that the assumptions (1) – (3) in Proposition 6.9 and (1) – (2) in Proposition 8.3 hold for elementary pieces.

We will repeatedly use results from Appendix A.

8.2.A. Orientations of capping operators. Recall the capping operators $\bar{\partial}_{p\pm} = \bar{\partial}_{p\pm,\lambda}$ and $\bar{\partial}_p = \bar{\partial}_{p,\lambda}$, defined in Section 5.4.C. More precisely, the former were operators defined on the 1-punctured disk with associated boundary conditions $R_{\pm} = R_{\pm,\lambda}$, which depended on λ in such a way so that $R_{\pm,\lambda} \rightarrow \text{id}$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. The latter were operators defined on the non-punctured disk with boundary conditions obtained by gluing $R_{+,\lambda}$ to $R_{-,\lambda}$. Also recall that we had put weights on the Sobolev spaces associated to $\bar{\partial}_{p\pm,\lambda}$. These weights allow us to extend the definition of $\bar{\partial}_{p\pm,\lambda}$ and $\bar{\partial}_{p,\lambda}$ to also be Fredholm operators for $\lambda = 0$. More precisely, we get that the $\bar{\partial}$ -operators

$$\bar{\partial}_{p\pm,0} : \mathcal{H}_{2,w_{p,\pm}}[\text{id}] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,w_{p,\pm}}[0], \quad \bar{\partial}_{p,0} : \mathcal{H}_2[\text{id}] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1[0]$$

are Fredholm. Here the weights $w_{p,\pm}$ are the ones defined in Section 5.4.C. Moreover, we have the following.

Lemma 8.5. *There is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that we have oriented bundles $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{p,\pm}$ and $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_p$ over $[0, \lambda_0]$, with fibers $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{p,\pm,\lambda}$ and $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{p,\lambda}$, respectively, satisfying*

$$\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{p,+} \simeq [0, \lambda_0] \times T_p W^s(p)$$

$$\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{p,-} \simeq [0, \lambda_0] \times T_p W^u(p)$$

$$\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_p \simeq [0, \lambda_0] \times T_p M$$

with the trivialization given by evaluation at the puncture p . Moreover, the orientation of the fibers of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_p$ coincides with the canonical orientation.

Proof. Follows from Corollary A.7, Corollary A.9 and the fact that the boundary conditions $R_{\pm,\lambda}$ are split. $\square$

Now we have all that we need to prove that the capping orientations in Definition 5.33 are well-defined.

Lemma 8.6. *For each $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small we get that the orientations in Definition 5.33 induce the canonical orientation of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{p,\lambda}$ under the gluing sequence (5.26).*

Proof. Consider the exact sequences

p irreversible:

$$(8.5) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} T_p M \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}} \begin{bmatrix} T_p W^u(p) \\ T_p W^s(p) \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

p reversible:

$$(8.6) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} T_p M \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}} \begin{bmatrix} T_p W^u(p) \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ T_p W^s(p) \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

where the non-trivial map $\tilde{\psi}$ is given by $\partial_{x_i} \mapsto \partial_{x_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n+2$, in the given trivialization (where we trivialize the subbundle $\text{Aux}_1 \oplus \text{Aux}_2$ by the vectors $\partial_{x_{n+1}}$ and $\partial_{x_{n+2}}$). The lemma follows once we have proved that $\tilde{\psi}$ induces the same orientation on $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}, \lambda}$, for each λ sufficiently small, as the corresponding map ψ in (5.26) does, after having identified $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{p \pm, \lambda}$ with $T_p W^u(p)$ and $T_p W^s(u)$, respectively, and $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{p, \lambda}$ with $T_p M$, as in Lemma 8.5.

But that this holds follows from the arguments in the second part of the proof of Proposition 8.3. $\square$

8.2.B. *Orientations of 1-valent pieces.* Now we prove that the capping orientation of a sub flow tree Γ going from a one-valent puncture p to a special puncture q coincides with the orientation given in Definition 3.3.

Choose a trivialization of TM along Γ so that $TM = TW^u(p) \oplus W$ for some complementary space W in the case when p is positive, and so that $TM = TW^s(p) \oplus W$ for some complementary space W in the case when p is negative. Recall that we identify T^*M with $\mathbb{C}^n$ in a neighborhood of Γ , and also recall the operator $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} : \mathcal{H}_{2, \mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1, \mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ described in Section 6.1. By taking the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, we see that the boundary conditions tend to constant boundary conditions, and due to our choice of weights $\mathbf{w}_\Gamma$ we get a well-defined Fredholm problem in the limit $\lambda = 0$, given by

$$\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_0} : \mathcal{H}_{2, \mu}[\text{id}] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1, \mu}[0].$$

By Lemma A.8 we have that $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ is surjective for λ sufficiently small, with a kernel of dimension $\dim W^u(p)$ if p is positive, and of dimension $\dim W^s(p)$ if p is negative, spanned by functions $u_1^\lambda, \dots, u_k^\lambda$ satisfying

$$\|u_i^\lambda - \partial_{x_i}\|_{2, \mu} \rightarrow 0, \quad \lambda \rightarrow 0$$

where $k = \dim W^u(p)$ if p positive, and $k = \dim W^s(p)$ if p is negative. Moreover, the vectors $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_k})$ give a basis for $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_0}$, and by the explicit descriptions of the vectors $u_1^\lambda, \dots, u_k^\lambda$ from [Ekh07] we see that we can choose them also so that

$$|\text{ev}_q(u_i^\lambda) - \text{ev}_q(\partial_{x_i})| \rightarrow 0$$

as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 8.7. An explicit basis for $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ is given by

$$(e^{i\theta_\lambda} e^{-\theta_\lambda(\tau+it)} \partial_{x_1}, \dots, e^{i\theta_\lambda} e^{-\theta_\lambda(\tau+it)} \partial_{x_k}).$$

Hence we get the following

Corollary 8.8. *We have a vector bundle $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma} \subset [0, \lambda_0] \times \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}(\mathbb{R} \times [0, 1], \mathbb{C}^n)$ given by $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma} = \{(\lambda, v \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda})\}$, which is isomorphic to $[0, \lambda_0] \times \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_0}$ and with topology given by (8.3) and (8.4), after having identified $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_0}$ with $T_q \mathcal{F}_q(\Gamma)$ via evaluation. A trivialization $\xi : \text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma} \rightarrow [0, \lambda_0] \times \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_0}$ is given by $\xi_\lambda(u_i^\lambda) = (\lambda, \partial_{x_i})$, $i = 1, \dots, k$.*

In the case of a positive (negative) puncture we can replace $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_0}$ by $T_x W^u(q)$ ($T_x W^s(q)$) for any $x \in \Gamma$, and an orientation of this space induces canonically an orientation on $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ via the trivialization ξ . We have the following.

Lemma 8.9. *The capping orientation of Γ is given as follows.*

p positive: If $\partial_{x_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \partial_{x_k}$ represents the capping orientation of $T_q W^u(p)$, then the (stabilized) capping orientation of Γ_λ is given by $(-1)^{(n+1)\dim(W^u(q))} (v_\lambda^1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_\lambda^k)$. In particular,

$$\xi_\lambda : \bigwedge^{\max} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \rightarrow (-1)^{(n+1)\dim(W^u(p))} \bigwedge^{\max} T_p W^u(p)$$

is an isomorphism of oriented vector spaces, where $T_p W^u(p)$ is given its capping orientation.

p negative: If $\partial_{x_1} \wedge \dots \wedge \partial_{x_k}$ represents the capping orientation of $T_q W^s(p)$, then the (stabilized) capping orientation of Γ_λ is given by $v_\lambda^1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_\lambda^k$. In particular,

$$\xi_\lambda : \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \rightarrow T_p W^s(p)$$

is an isomorphism of oriented vector spaces, where $T_p W^s(p)$ is given its capping orientation.

Proof. We prove the lemma in the case when p is positive, the other case is completely similar.

First recall that the capping orientations of $W^s(p)$ and $W^u(p)$ are related in a way so that

$$(8.7) \quad T_p M = T_p W^u(p) \oplus T_p W^s(p)$$

as oriented vector spaces. Also recall the definition of the capping orientations of the capping operators in Section 5.4.D.

For each fixed λ the stabilized capping orientation of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ is given by the exact sequence

$$(8.8) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\psi} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{p}^+, \lambda} \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0.$$

Here $\bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$ denotes the corresponding fully capped problem, and ψ is L^2 -projection after having cut off the elements in the second column to embed them in $\mathcal{H}_2(D, \mathbb{C}^n)$, as described in Section 5.3. Here D is the non-punctured, compact disk.

Using Corollary 8.8 and the arguments in the second part of the proof of Proposition 8.3 we see that for λ sufficiently small the sequence (8.8) can be replaced by the following sequences

p irreversible:

$$0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} T_p M \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}} \begin{bmatrix} T_p W^s(p) \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \\ T_p W^u(p) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

p reversible:

$$0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} T_p M \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\psi}} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Aux}_1 \\ T_p W^s(p) \\ \text{Aux}_2 \\ T_p W^u(p) \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

where $\tilde{\psi}$ is given by projection, and where in the first case $W^s(p)$ is given its capping orientation, and in the second case it is given $(-1)^{\dim W^s(p)}$ times its capping orientation (coming from the orientations of the capping operators.)

We see that in the first case, this induces the capping orientation on $W^u(p)$, times

$$(-1)^{\dim(W^s(p)) \dim(W^u(p))} = (-1)^{(n+1) \dim(W^u(p))},$$

since $\dim(W^s(p)) = n - \dim(W^u(p))$, and in the second case we get the capping orientation on $W^u(p)$ times

$$(-1)^{\dim(W^s(p)) \dim(W^u(p)) + \dim(W^s(p)) + \dim(W^s(p))} = (-1)^{(n+1) \dim(W^u(p))}.$$

□

8.2.C. Orientations of 2-valent pieces. We have a similar result for the case when the true puncture p is 2-valent, but here we get that the problem associated to the tree Γ is an isomorphism.

Again we extend the associated family of operators $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ to the limit $\lambda = 0$ by using that the boundary conditions tend to the identity. The corresponding $\bar{\partial}$ -problems will for each λ sufficiently small give a surjective operator with trivial kernel. This is clear in the limit $\lambda = 0$, and thus the same thing holds for all λ sufficiently small, since we have a family of Fredholm operators and surjectivity is an open condition.

Now we calculate the capping orientation of Γ .

Lemma 8.10. *The stabilized capping orientation of Γ is given by $(-1)^\sigma$ satisfying*

$$T_p M = (-1)^\sigma T_p W^s(p)$$

as oriented vector spaces if p is positive, and

$$T_p M = (-1)^{\sigma+\nu} T_p W^u(p)$$

if p is negative. The sign ν is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \nu = n & \quad \text{if } p \text{ is of type 2 and either} \\ & \quad \text{both the negative punctures of } \Gamma \text{ are reversible} \\ & \quad \text{or} \\ & \quad \text{both the punctures of } \Gamma \text{ different from } p \text{ are reversible} \\ \nu = 0 & \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

The space $T_p M$ is given the orientation from M , and $T_p W^s(p)$ ($T_p W^u(p)$) is given its capping orientation.

Proof. The statement is proved in a way similar to the proof of Lemma 8.9, using that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ is trivial, and that the capping kernels are isomorphic to $T_p M$. $\square$

8.2.D. *Orientations of Y_0 -pieces.* We have a similar result for the case of elementary Y_0 -trees Γ , but here we get that the problem associated to the tree is surjective with an n -dimensional kernel isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^n$ via evaluation. We pick a trivialization of TM along Γ using the flat coordinates defined here, and we let $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ denote the $\bar{\partial}$ -operator associated to Γ .

The following is proven in a similar way as for the 1-and 2-pieces.

Lemma 8.11. *We have a vector bundle $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma} \subset [0, \lambda_0] \times \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}(\Delta_3, \mathbb{C}^n)$ given by $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma} = \{(\lambda, v \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda})\}$, which is isomorphic to $[0, \lambda_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and with topology given by (8.3) and (8.4) (after having identified $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_0}$ with the tangent space of the flow-out of Γ at a special puncture via evaluation). A trivialization $\xi : \text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma} \rightarrow [0, \lambda_0] \times \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_0}$ is given by $\xi_\lambda(u_i^\lambda) = (\lambda, \partial_{x_i})$, where $(u_1^\lambda, \dots, u_n^\lambda)$ is a basis for $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ satisfying*

$$\|u_i^\lambda - \partial_{x_i}\|_{2,\mu} + |\text{ev}_p(u_i^\lambda) - \text{ev}_p(\partial_{x_i})| \rightarrow 0, \quad \lambda \rightarrow 0,$$

where p is a special puncture of Γ . The capping orientation of Γ_λ is given by $u_1^\lambda \wedge \dots \wedge u_n^\lambda$.

8.2.E. *Orientations of connecting pieces.* This is completely similar to the Y_0 -case.

8.2.F. *Orientations of end-pieces.* Now let Γ be a sub flow tree containing an end e and one positive special puncture q_1 , and no other vertices. We prove that the capping orientation of Γ coincides with the orientation given in Definition 3.7.

Choose a trivialization of TM along Γ so that $T_e \Pi(\Sigma) = \text{Span}(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}})$, and recall that the induced boundary conditions tend to constant $\mathbb{R}^n$ -boundary conditions, except for in a neighborhood of the end point where it is split $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \oplus U_+$, where U_+ denotes a uniform $+\pi$ rotation. Assume that ∂_{x_n} points in the outward normal direction of $\Pi(\Lambda_e)$ at e , where Λ_e is the union of the two sheets of Λ containing e , and that $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n})$ gives an oriented basis for $T_e M$. Again we extend the boundary conditions to the limit $\lambda = 0$, using that we have control over the region where the $+\pi$ -rotation is performed. We also extend the family of operators $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ to $\lambda = 0$.

Lemma 8.12. *For λ sufficiently small the kernel of $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ is spanned by functions $v_1^\lambda, \dots, v_n^\lambda$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \|v_i^\lambda - \partial_{x_i}\|_{2,\mu} &= 0, & i = 1, \dots, n-1, \\ \lim_{\lambda_1 \rightarrow \lambda_2} \|v_n^{\lambda_1} - v_n^{\lambda_2}\|_{2,\mu} &= 0, \\ \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} |\text{ev}_{q_1}(v_i^\lambda) - \text{ev}_{q_1}(\partial_{x_i})| &= 0, & i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have a vector bundle

$$\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma} = \{(\lambda, v \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda})\} \subset [0, \lambda_0] \times \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}(\Delta_2, \mathbb{C}^n)$$

which is isomorphic to $[0, \lambda_0] \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and with topology given by (8.3) and (8.4).

Proof. By [[Ekh07], Lemma 6.4] it follows that the problem in the limit is surjective and that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_0}$ is n -dimensional, spanned by functions of the form $\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}}, v_n^0$ in our chosen trivialization. Here v_n^0 is a real linear combination of the two solutions of the Maslov index problem given by rotating $\mathbb{R}$ an angle of π in $\mathbb{R} \otimes \mathbb{C}$, satisfying that v_n^0 vanishes at the end point.

The statement now follows from Lemma A.3, together with the explicit description of kernel elements on the trivial strip as in Remark 8.7. $\square$

Lemma 8.13. *The stabilized capping orientation of Γ_λ is given by $(-1)^n v_1^\lambda \wedge \dots \wedge v_n^\lambda$.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma 8.9 we get a capping sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \\ \text{Aux}_2 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Aux}_2 \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0$$

where $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \simeq \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ via evaluation. From this sequence we get a sign n . $\square$

8.2.G. *Orientations of switch-pieces.* We have a similar result for the case when Γ is an elementary tree with a switch-vertex s .

Choose a trivialization of TM along Γ so that $T_s \Pi(\Sigma) = \text{Span}(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}})$, and so that the induced boundary conditions tend to either $(\mathbb{R}^{n-1} \oplus U_-(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{R}^n)$ or $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \oplus U_-(\mathbb{R}))$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, where $U_- : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow U(1)$ is equal to the identity except for in a neighborhood of the switch point where it performs a uniform $-\pi$ -rotation. Assume that ∂_{x_n} points in the outward normal direction of $\Pi(\Lambda_s)$ at s , where Λ_s is the union of the two sheets of Λ containing s , and that $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n})$ gives an oriented basis for $T_s M$. Again we extend the boundary conditions to the limit $\lambda = 0$ by using that we have control of the region where the $-\pi$ -rotation is performed. Using this we extend the family of operators $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ to $\lambda = 0$.

Lemma 8.14. *For λ sufficiently small the kernel of $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ is spanned by functions $v_1^\lambda, \dots, v_{n-1}^\lambda$ satisfying*

$$\|v_i^\lambda - \partial_{x_i}\|_{2,\mu} + |\text{ev}_p(v_i^\lambda) - \text{ev}_p(\partial_{x_i})| \rightarrow 0, \lambda \rightarrow 0, i = 1, \dots, n-1,$$

where p is a special puncture of Γ .

In particular, we have a vector bundle

$$\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma} = \{(\lambda, v \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda})\} \subset [0, \lambda_0] \times \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}(\Delta_2, \mathbb{C}^n)$$

which is isomorphic to $[0, \lambda_0] \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and with topology given by (8.3) and (8.4). A trivialization ξ is given by $\xi_\lambda(v_i^\lambda) = \partial_{x_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. For $\lambda = 0$ it follows from [[Ekh07], Lemma 6.6] that the problem is surjective and that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_0}$ is $n-1$ -dimensional, spanned by functions of the form $\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}}$ in our chosen trivialization. The statement now follows from Lemma A.3, together with the explicit understanding of the behavior of the kernel elements in neighborhoods of the special punctures, as in Remark 8.7. $\square$

Lemma 8.15. *The stabilized capping orientation of Γ_λ is given by $-v_1^\lambda \wedge \dots \wedge v_{n-1}^\lambda$.*

Proof. This is similar to the proof of Lemma 8.9. Let p_1 be the positive puncture of Γ . Then the capping sequence for Γ , stabilized with the cusp-stabilization vector v_s , looks like

p_1 irreversible:

$$(8.9) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \\ \text{Aux}_1^2 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \\ v_s^\lambda \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\psi} \begin{bmatrix} v_s^\lambda \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_1 \\ \text{Aux}_2 \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0,$$

p_1 reversible:

$$(8.10) \quad 0 \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \\ \text{Aux}_2 \\ v_s^\lambda \end{bmatrix} \xrightarrow{\psi} \begin{bmatrix} v_s^\lambda \\ \text{Aux}_2 \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0.$$

Here the notation Aux_1^2 is used to indicate that we have a two-dimensional kernel in the Aux_1 -direction. If we now use that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda} \simeq \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \simeq T_s \Pi(\Sigma)$, $\text{Span } v_s^\lambda \simeq T_s \Pi(\Sigma)^\perp$ we see that this sequence induces the orientation $(-1)^1 T_s \Pi(\Sigma)$ on $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$, where $T_s \Pi(\Sigma)$ is given the orientation by outward normal last, regarded as the boundary of $\Pi(\Lambda_s)$. $\square$

8.2.H. Orientations of Y_1 -pieces. We have a similar result for the case of elementary trees Γ with a Y_1 -vertex v . Choose a trivialization of TM along Γ so that $T_v \Pi(\Sigma) = \text{Span}(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_{n-1}})$, and recall that the induced boundary conditions tend to $(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \oplus U_-(\mathbb{R}), \mathbb{R}^n)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, where $U_- : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow U(1)$ is equal to the identity except for in a neighborhood of the boundary minimum where it perform a uniform $-\pi$ -rotation. Assume that ∂_{x_n} points in the outward normal direction of $\Pi(\Lambda_v)$ at v , where Λ_v is the union of the two sheets of Λ containing v , and that $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n})$ gives an oriented basis for $T_v M$. Again we extend the boundary conditions to the limit $\lambda = 0$ by using that we have control of the region where the $-\pi$ -rotation is performed. Using this we extend the family of operators $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ to $\lambda = 0$.

The following is proven in a similar way as for the switch-pieces.

Lemma 8.16. *We have a vector bundle $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma} \subset [0, \lambda_0] \times \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}(\Delta_3, \mathbb{C}^n)$ given by $\text{Ker } \underline{\Gamma} = \{(\lambda, v \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda})\}$, which is isomorphic to $[0, \lambda_0] \times \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, and with topology given by (8.3) and (8.4). A trivialization ξ is given by $\xi_\lambda(u_i^\lambda) = \partial_{x_i}$, where $(u_1^\lambda, \dots, u_{n-1}^\lambda)$ is a basis for $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ satisfying*

$$\|u_i^\lambda - \partial_{x_i}\|_{2,\mu} + |\text{ev}_p(u_i^\lambda) - \text{ev}_p(\partial_{x_i})| \rightarrow 0, \quad \lambda \rightarrow 0.$$

The stabilized capping orientation of Γ_λ is given by $-u_1^\lambda \wedge \dots \wedge u_{n-1}^\lambda$.

Corollary 8.17. *It follows that the assumptions (1) and (2) in Proposition 8.3 hold for all elementary trees (and also the assumptions (1), (2) and (3) in Proposition 6.9).*

8.3. The gluing algorithm gives the stabilized capping orientation of sub flow trees. Let Γ be a sub flow tree. In this section we show that the formulas given in Section 3.4 coincide with the stabilized capping orientation of the pre-glued disk associated to Γ . By Proposition 8.3 it is enough to prove that this holds in the limit $\lambda = 0$. Hence it suffices to prove the following corollary of Proposition 8.3.

Proposition 8.18. *Assume that we are in the situation of gluing given by one of the cases $(y0g) - (sgp)$, and assume that all partial flow trees involved as input in the gluing satisfies the assumptions (1) and (2) in Proposition 8.3. Then the glued tree Γ also satisfies these assumptions, and the stabilized capping orientation of Γ in the limit equals the orientation of the flow-out of Γ given in Section 3.4.*

Moreover, in the cases $(y0g) - (ng)$, the pre-stabilized capping orientation of Γ in the limit equals the orientation of the intersection manifold given in the corresponding definition in Section 3.4.

To prove Proposition 8.3, we first recall the intersection orientation $\mathcal{O}_{\text{int}}$ introduced in Section 3.4, defined for vector spaces $V, V_1, V_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $V = V_1 \cap V_2$, $V_1 + V_2 = \mathbb{R}^n$. We will get use of the following observation.

Lemma 8.19. *Let $\mathcal{O}(V)$ denote the orientation of V induced by the exact sequence (3.2) via the orientation rule (5.2). Then*

$$\mathcal{O}_{\text{int}}(V) = (-1)^\sigma \mathcal{O}(V),$$

where

$$\sigma = \dim V_1 \cdot (1 + \dim V).$$

Proof. If we use the notation from Section 3.4 we see that the orientation convention (5.2) induces the orientation

$$-\tilde{V}_1 \oplus V \oplus \tilde{V}_2 = \mathbb{R}^n$$

on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and the intersection orientation induces the orientation

$$V \oplus \tilde{V}_1 \oplus \tilde{V}_2 = \mathbb{R}^n.$$

These two orientations differs by $(-1)^\sigma$,

$$\sigma = \dim \tilde{V}_1 + \dim \tilde{V}_1 \cdot \dim V = (\dim V_1 + \dim V) \cdot (1 + \dim V) = \dim V_1 \cdot (1 + \dim V).$$

□

Proof of Proposition 8.18. We will prove this for each of the gluings (y0g) – (sgp), case by case. In each case, recall the setup given in the corresponding paragraph in Section 3.4.

Gluing at a Y_0 -vertex: Let Γ_v be the Y_0 -piece we are gluing at, and let Γ_1 and Γ_2 denote the two sub flow trees that are glued to Γ_v , ordered as in Section 3.4.B. Let p_i denote the special puncture of Γ_v to which Γ_i is glued.

By applying Proposition 8.3 twice we get, for λ sufficiently small, that the pre-stabilized kernel of Γ is spanned by vectors $v_1^\lambda, \dots, v_m^\lambda$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_i^{\lambda_1} - v_i^{\lambda_2}\|_{2,\mu,\lambda_2} &\rightarrow 0, & \lambda_1 &\rightarrow \lambda_2, \\ |\text{ev}_v(v_i^\lambda) - \partial_{x_i}| &\rightarrow 0, & \lambda &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, m$. We also get that the pre-stabilized capping orientation of Γ can be computed using the sequence (8.1) twice, if we for each gluing multiply the result by the gluing sign coming from Proposition 7.17.

To perform this computation, we start by gluing Γ_2 to Γ_v , which will give us an intermediate tree Γ_{2v} . From the gluing sequence (8.1) we get that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} \simeq \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2v,ps}}$ oriented (both via the ordinary orientation rule and the intersection orientation rule), and the gluing sign from Proposition 7.17 equals 0.

Now we glue Γ_1 to Γ_{2v} . From Lemma 8.19 we get that the orientation of

$$\mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma) = T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_1) \cap T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_{2v})$$

induced by the gluing sequence (8.1) equals the intersection orientation of the same space, times $(-1)^{\nu_1}$, where

$$\nu_1 = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \cdot (\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps}} + 1).$$

Here we have dropped the λ -dependence and use that the dimensions of the kernels are constant in λ if λ is sufficiently small.

Moreover, the gluing sign from Proposition 7.17 equals

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_2 = & e(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + c(\Gamma_1) + \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1)) + (s(\Gamma_2) + Y_1(\Gamma_2)) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)) \\ & + \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}}) + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \cdot (n + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} + e(\Gamma_2)). \end{aligned}$$

If we now sum everything up, and use that

$$\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps}} + n = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}},$$

we get that the pre-stabilized capping orientation of Γ is given by the intersection orientation of $\mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma)$ times $(-1)^\nu$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \nu = \nu_1 + \nu_2 = & e(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + c(\Gamma_1) + \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}}) \\ & + (s(\Gamma_2) + Y_1(\Gamma_2)) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)) + \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}}). \end{aligned}$$

To calculate the stabilized orientation of Γ , we must stabilize the $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps,\lambda}}$ -problem by adding the missing conformal variation w^λ to the domain of the operator. Recall that this family of vectors has a well-defined limit $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} w^\lambda = w$, corresponding to the covariantly constant vector field tangent to the edges of Γ_v , pointing in the direction opposite to the flow direction. We claim that the stabilized problem $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{s,\lambda}}$ satisfies the

assumptions (1) and (2) of Proposition 8.3. Indeed, for $j = 1, 2$ let $u_j^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{j,s,\lambda}}$ such that $\text{ev}_{p_i}(u_j^\lambda) \rightarrow f_j$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, where $f_j \in T_{p_j}M$ represents the flow direction of Γ at p_j . As in the proof of Proposition 6.9 it follows that we can find functions r_j^λ so that $w^\lambda + u_1^\lambda + u_2^\lambda + r_1^\lambda + r_2^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{\lambda,s}}$ and so that $\|r_j^\lambda\| \rightarrow 0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Moreover we can choose u_j^λ continuously in λ , $j = 1, 2$. By the asymptotic behavior of w^λ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ the result follows.

Now we use Lemma 7.16 to see that the stabilized capping orientation of Γ is given by

$$(-1)^\sigma \mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma) \oplus \text{Span}(w)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_v(\Gamma)$ is given the pre-stabilized capping orientation of Γ , $\text{Span}(w)$ is given the orientation of w , and

$$\sigma = \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) + 1.$$

Gluing at a negative 2-valent puncture: This is similar to the case of gluing at a Y_0 -vertex. The only difference is that now we only have to perform one gluing, and that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$ while $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_q}$ is trivial.

From Section 3.4.C we have that the intersection orientation of $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps}}$ is given by $(-1)^{\sigma_1 + \sigma_2}$, and by Lemma 8.19 we get that this orientation differs from the one induced by the sequence (8.1) by a sign $(-1)^n$.

The gluing sign from Proposition 7.17 equals

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_2 &= n \cdot \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} + n \cdot (n + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} + \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) + e(\Gamma_1)) \\ &= n + n \cdot (\dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) + e(\Gamma_1)) \end{aligned}$$

in the case when q is of type 1, and equals

$$\nu_2 = n \cdot \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} = n$$

in the case when q is of type 2. Summing up all signs we get the expression for the intersection orientation given in Definition 3.14.

Stabilization is done completely similar to the Y_0 -case.

Gluing at a Y_1 -vertex: This is again similar to the Y_0 -case. The only difference is that the Y_1 -piece does not have kernel isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^n$, but to $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Thus, in the first gluing sequence, where we glue Γ_2 to Γ_v to get an intermediate tree Γ_{2v} with pre-stabilized kernel isomorphic to $T_v \mathcal{F}_v(\Gamma_2) \cap T_v \Pi(\Sigma)$, we get that the difference between the intersection orientation and the orientation induced by the sequence (8.1) is given by $(-1)^{\nu_1}$,

$$\nu_1 = 1 \cdot \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}}.$$

This since $\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2v,ps}} = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} - 1$. The gluing sign from Proposition 7.17 under this gluing equals $(-1)^{\nu_2}$,

$$\nu_2 = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} + n + e(\Gamma_2)$$

and hence we get that the total sign from this first gluing is given by

$$\nu_1 + \nu_2 = n + e(\Gamma_2).$$

In the second gluing, where we glue Γ_1 to Γ_{2v} to get the pre-stabilized kernel of Γ , we get that the difference between the intersection orientation and the orientation induced by the sequence (8.1) is given by $(-1)^{\nu_3}$,

$$\nu_3 = \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \cdot (1 + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps}})$$

and the gluing sign is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_4 = & e(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + c(\Gamma_1) + \dim V_{\operatorname{con}}(\Gamma_1)) \\ & + \dim V_{\operatorname{con}}(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}}) + (Y_1(\Gamma_2) + s(\Gamma_2) + 1) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)) \\ & + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \cdot (n + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} + 1 + e(\Gamma_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Summing up, using that $\dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{ps}} = \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} + n + 1 \pmod{2}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \nu = & e(\Gamma_1) + e(\Gamma_2) + e(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + c(\Gamma_1) + \dim V_{\operatorname{con}}(\Gamma_1) + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}}) \\ & + (s(\Gamma_2) + Y_1(\Gamma_2)) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)) + \dim V_{\operatorname{con}}(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}}). \end{aligned}$$

To get the stabilized kernel we proceed as in the case of Y_0 -vertices.

Gluing at a switch-piece, gluing at the negative special puncture: The proof is similar to the first step of the proof of Proposition 3.15. That is, from Lemma 8.19 we get a sign $(-1)^{\dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}}}$ and the gluing sign from Proposition 7.17 equals

$$\nu_1 = \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} + n + e(\Gamma_1).$$

The result follows.

Gluing at a switch-piece, gluing at the positive special puncture: Again the proof is similar to the first step of the proof of Proposition 3.15. But, due to the order of the trees, we now get that the intersection orientation of $T_s \Pi(\Sigma) \cap T_s \mathcal{F}_s(\Gamma_2)$ differs from the orientation induced by the sequence (8.1) by a sign $(-1)^{\sigma_1}$,

$$\sigma_1 = (n - 1) \cdot (1 + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} - 1).$$

The gluing sign from Proposition 7.17 equals

$$\sigma_2 = \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s}} \cdot (n + \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}}) + s(\Gamma_2) \cdot n = (n - 1) \cdot \dim \operatorname{Ker} \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s}} + n \cdot s(\Gamma_2),$$

where we use the fact that the vertices of Γ_2 are only switches and 1-valent punctures. Hence the result follows. $\square$

8.4. The gluing algorithm gives the capping orientation of rigid flow trees.

In this section we prove that the formulas for the orientation of a rigid flow tree Γ given in Section 3.5 coincides with the capping sign of the corresponding pre-glued disk w_λ for λ sufficiently small. That is, we will prove the following.

Proposition 8.20. *Let Γ be a rigid flow tree and let $\{w_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]}$ be a family of pre-glued disks associated to Γ as in Section 6. Then the sign $\sigma_s(\Gamma)$ defined in Section 3 equals the capping sign of w_λ defined in Section 5 for all λ sufficiently small. In particular, the capping orientation of w_λ is independent of λ for λ sufficiently small.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of Proposition 8.18 we divide the proof into the cases given in Section 3.5, and we use the notation introduced in that section.

Trees with nontrivial automorphism group: In this case the kernel of the associated $\bar{\partial}$ -operator will be 1-dimensional, both before and after the stabilization. This since the stabilization only consists of adding cusp-stabilization vectors associated to the switches of the tree Γ_2 , and this does not affect the dimension of the $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$ -problem.

Let w_λ be the pre-glued disk associated to Γ for λ sufficiently small. The capping sign of Γ is by definition given by comparing the capping orientation of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$ with the flow orientation of Γ . Indeed, recall the orientation chosen on the group of conformal automorphisms $\mathcal{T}_2$ in Remark 5.15. The capping sign of the tree comes from comparing the capping orientation of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$ with the orientation of $\mathcal{T}_2$ under the isomorphism $T\mathcal{T}_2 \ni v \mapsto dw_\lambda \cdot v \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$. Since the upper hemisphere of the disk D_2 corresponds to $\mathbb{R} + 0i$ on the strip $\Delta_2 = \Delta(\Gamma)$, and since this part of the strip is mapped to the upper part of the Lagrangian lift of the tree Γ which is oriented by the flow direction of Γ , it follows that the capping orientation of w_λ coincides with the positive orientation of $T\mathcal{T}_2$ if and only if it agrees with the flow direction of Γ in M .

By our choice of trivialization, this means that we should compare the orientation of the flow line of Γ given by $+\partial_{x_1}$ with the image of the oriented kernel of $\bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$ under evaluation. To compute the latter, we first compute the stabilized capping orientation of Γ . By Proposition 8.3 and Lemma 8.19, this is given by the intersection orientation $(-1)^{\sigma_1} \partial_{x_1}$ of Γ , times $(-1)^{\sigma_2 + \sigma_3}$, where

$$\sigma_2 = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,ps}} \cdot (1 + 1) = 0$$

is the sign from Lemma 8.19, and

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_3 &= \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,ps}} \cdot (n + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2}) + \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)) \\ &= \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,ps}} \cdot (\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,ps}} + 1) + \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)), \end{aligned}$$

is the gluing sign from Proposition 7.17. Hence we get that the stabilized capping orientation of Γ is given by $(-1)^{\nu_1} \partial_{x_1}$,

$$\nu_1 = \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3 = \sigma_1 + \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)).$$

Now we use Proposition 7.14 to go from the stabilized problem to the non-stabilized problem $\bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$, and we see that this gives a sign

$$\nu_2 = (n + e(\Gamma)) \cdot (n + n + \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)) = (n + e(\Gamma)) \cdot \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2).$$

Finally, to get the capping orientation of the $\bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$ -problem with boundary conditions given by the spin structure of Λ , we must in addition multiply by the sign $(-1)^{\beta(s, \Theta_\Gamma)}$, defined in Section 3.2.B.

Summing everything up, we get that the capping orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$ is given by $(-1)^\nu \partial_{x_1}$, where

$$\nu = \sigma_1 + \beta(s, \Gamma_\Gamma).$$

Thus the capping sign of Γ is given by the formula in Definition 3.21.

Trees with trivial automorphism group, the positive puncture is 1-valent: If the automorphism group of the domain corresponding to the rigid flow tree Γ is trivial, then we have that $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_s}$ also is trivial, and the rightmost nontrivial map in the sequence (5.18) are isomorphisms. By definition, the capping sign of Γ is given by the sign of this isomorphism. To compute this, we proceed similar to the case of trees with non-trivial automorphism group, with the only modification that we have to consider the orientation of the space of conformal variations instead of the automorphism group. This we do by using the stabilized capping orientation of Γ together with the commuting diagram (7.30).

The stabilized capping orientation of Γ is computed using Proposition 8.3 with the pre-stabilized tree Γ_1 and the stabilized tree Γ_2 as inputs. By Lemma 8.19, the orientation induced by the sequence (8.1) differs from the intersection orientation of Γ by a sign $(-1)^{\sigma_1}$, where

$$\sigma_1 = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,ps}}.$$

The gluing sign from Proposition 7.17 equals

$$\sigma_2 = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,ps}} + s(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)),$$

noting that $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2)$ is empty and that $\dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,ps}} + \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2} = n$.

Adding σ_1 to σ_2 and simplifying yields

$$\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 = s(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)).$$

Since we are given that the intersection orientation of Γ equals $(-1)^{\nu_1}$, we see that the stabilized capping orientation of Γ is given by

$$(-1)^{\nu_1 + s(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1))}.$$

From Proposition 7.14 it follows that the difference between the orientation of the stabilized and non-stabilized problem of Γ equals $(-1)^{\sigma_3}$, where

$$\sigma_3 = (n + e(\Gamma)) \cdot (n + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}) + \dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}.$$

If we now add all these signs together, using that $\text{index } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} = n + \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$ and that $\dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) = \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_1) + s(\Gamma_2)$, $e(\Gamma) = e(\Gamma_1)$, we get

$$\nu_1 + \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3 = \nu_1 + (s(\Gamma_1) + Y_1(\Gamma_1)) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)) + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) + s(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma).$$

Now it remains to multiply this sign by the signs coming from orientations of the space of conformal variations. First recall that we have inductively given $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$ the orientation $(v_1, \dots, \hat{v}_j, \dots, v_{m-1})$, which by Corollary 5.18 differs from the standard orientation of $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$ by a sign

$$(-1)^{j+1}.$$

Next we must compensate for the fact that we do not want to use the standard orientation of $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma) \simeq \mathcal{C}_{m+e(\Gamma)}$, but the orientation given by $\mathcal{C}_{m+1} \oplus V(e(\Gamma))$ from equation (6.9). By Lemma 6.14 this implies that we must multiply by a sign

$$(-1)^\mu,$$

where μ is given in Definition 2.16. In addition, by Lemma 6.13 we should multiply all this by the sign $(-1)^{\sigma_4}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_4 &= e(\Gamma) \cdot (\dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma - \dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}} + k(e)) + k(e) \cdot (e(\Gamma) - k(e) + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma) \\ &= e(\Gamma) \cdot (\dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma) + \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) - \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)) + k(e) \cdot (k(e) + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma),\end{aligned}$$

where $k(e) = \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} - \dim \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda}$, using the notation in Section 6.3.

If we add also the trivialization sign $\beta(\mathfrak{s}, \Theta_\Gamma)$ and then sum everything up, we get that the capping sign of w_λ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma &= \nu_1 + (s(\Gamma_1) + Y_1(\Gamma_1)) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)) + (e(\Gamma) + 1) \cdot (\dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) + s(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma)) \\ &\quad + j + 1 + \mu + \beta(\mathfrak{s}, \Theta_\Gamma) + e(\Gamma) \cdot \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma) + k(e) \cdot (k(e) + c(\Gamma)).\end{aligned}$$

Trees with trivial automorphism group, the positive puncture is 2-valent: This is similar to the case of 1-valent punctures, but now we have to perform two gluings to get the stabilized orientation of Γ .

First we glue Γ_2 to Γ_a . The gluing sequence (8.1) gives us the orientation $(-1)^{\nu_0 + \nu_2 + n}$ of the trivial kernel for the intermediate tree, using that the intersection orientation is given by $(-1)^{\nu_0 + \nu_2}$ and that the sign from Lemma 8.19 equals n . The gluing sign equals n .

In the second gluing we similarly get a sign $(-1)^{\nu_0 + \nu_1 + \nu_2 + n}$ from the gluing sequence, and a gluing sign

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_1 &= e(\Gamma_2) \cdot (n + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + c(\Gamma_1) + \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1)) + n \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_2)) \\ &\quad + (s(\Gamma_2) + Y_1(\Gamma_2)) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)).\end{aligned}$$

By going from the stabilized to the non-stabilized problem we get an additional sign

$$\sigma_2 = (n + e(\Gamma)) \cdot (n + \text{index } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}) + \dim \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{\Gamma}}.$$

When adding all these signs together we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 &= e(\Gamma_2) \cdot (\dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + c(\Gamma_1) + \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1)) + (s(\Gamma_2) + Y_1(\Gamma_2)) \cdot (n + e(\Gamma_1)) \\ &\quad + (n + e(\Gamma)) \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) + \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) + n.\end{aligned}$$

Now it remains to multiply by the signs coming from the space of conformal variations and the trivialization induced by the spin structure of Λ , which is similar to the case for 1-valent positive punctures. That is, we should multiply by $(-1)^{\sigma_3}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_3 &= e(\Gamma) \cdot (\dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma) + \dim \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) - \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)) + k(e) \cdot (k(e) + \dim \text{Aux } \Gamma) \\ &\quad + j + 1 + \mu + \beta(\mathfrak{s}, \Theta_\Gamma).\end{aligned}$$

Summing up we get that the capping sign of w_λ is given by $(-1)^\sigma$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma &= \nu_0 + \nu_1 + \nu_2 + k(e) \cdot (k(e) + c(\Gamma)) + j + 1 + \mu + \beta(\mathfrak{s}, \Theta_\Gamma) \\ &\quad + e(\Gamma_2) \cdot (\dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma_1) + c(\Gamma_1) + \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1)) + (s(\Gamma_2) + Y_1(\Gamma_2)) \cdot e(\Gamma_1) \\ &\quad + n \cdot (s(\Gamma_1) + Y_1(\Gamma_1)) + s(\Gamma) + Y_1(\Gamma) + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma) \\ &\quad + e(\Gamma) \cdot (\dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) + \dim V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) + \dim \mathcal{E}_k(\Gamma)).\end{aligned}$$

□

8.5. Proof of that the capping orientation of a tree is well-defined. In this section we prove that the capping orientation of the pre-glued disk w_λ associated to Γ coincides with the capping orientation of the corresponding true J -holomorphic disk u_λ for λ sufficiently small.

Again we will use the vector bundle set-up, and to that end we use the constructions from [Ekh07] to connect u_λ to w_λ by a path $(u_s(\lambda), \kappa_s(\lambda))$, $s \in [0, 1]$, of punctured disks $u_s(\lambda)$ with boundary on $\Pi_{\mathbb{C}}(\Lambda_\lambda)$ and with domain $\Delta(\kappa_s(\lambda))$. Here $\kappa_s(\lambda)$ indicates the conformal structure. We assume that $u_0(\lambda) = u_\lambda$ and $u_1(\lambda) = w_\lambda$. We give an outline of the construction of this path, and refer to [Ekh07] for the details.

First let $\phi_s : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $s \in [0, 1]$, be a family of diffeomorphisms so that $\phi_0 = \text{id}$ and so that ϕ_1 maps the standard domain of u_λ to the standard domain of w_λ . An explicit description of ϕ_s is given in [[Ekh07], Section 6.2.C], we summarize the most important features here.

- (1) $\frac{d\phi_s}{ds} = b\lambda^{-1}\alpha(\tau, t)\partial_\tau$, where $\alpha : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a function satisfying that $\alpha = 1$ in uniform neighborhoods of boundary minima, and has support in a larger neighborhood of the boundary minima.
- (2) $\|d\phi_s - \text{id}\|_\infty = O(s)$, $s \in [-1, 1]$,
- (3) $\|D^2\phi_s\|_\infty = O(s)$, $s \in [-1, 1]$.

Remark 8.21. From [Ekh07] it follows that the flow time taking $\Delta(u_\lambda)$ to $\Delta(w_\lambda)$ is given by $s = \mathcal{O}(\lambda \log(\lambda^{-1}))$, and hence for fixed λ we can rescale it.

By pre-composing w_λ with ϕ_s we get a disk $\tilde{u}_s(\lambda)$ with boundary arbitrarily close to the boundary of w_λ and with standard domain $\phi_s(\Delta(w_\lambda))$. Using the exponential map at the disks $\tilde{u}_s(\lambda)$ we can define the path $u_s(\lambda)$. In addition, by the constructions in [Ekh07] we may assume that

$$\|A_{s_1, \lambda} \circ \phi_{s_1} - A_{s_2, \lambda} \circ \phi_{s_2}\|_{C^2} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } s_1 \rightarrow s_2,$$

where $A_{s, \lambda} : \partial\Delta(\kappa_s(\lambda)) \rightarrow U(n)$ is the boundary condition induced by $u_s(\lambda)$.

By rigidity we may assume that the linearizations of $\bar{\partial}$ at u_λ and w_λ , restricted to $\mathcal{H}_{2, \mu}[u_\lambda]$ and $\mathcal{H}_{2, \mu}[w_\lambda]$, respectively, are either both injective or both surjective, and without loss of generality we will assume the former. From Section 7.4 it then follows that it is enough to prove the following result to get that the capping orientations of u_λ and w_λ coincide.

Lemma 8.22. *For each $\lambda > 0$ sufficiently small, there exists an isomorphism*

$$\chi_\lambda : \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{u_\lambda} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda}$$

so that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{u_\lambda} & \xrightarrow{\chi_\lambda} & \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda} \\ \simeq \downarrow \eta & & \simeq \downarrow \eta \\ V_{\text{con}}(u_\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\phi_{1,*}} & V_{\text{con}}(w_\lambda) \end{array}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{u}_\lambda} & \longrightarrow & \text{cap}(\Gamma) & \longrightarrow & \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{u_\lambda} & \longrightarrow & \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{u}_\lambda} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id} & & \downarrow \chi_\lambda & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} & \longrightarrow & \text{cap}(\Gamma) & \longrightarrow & \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{w_\lambda} & \longrightarrow & \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\hat{w}_\lambda} & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

commute. Here the leftmost and rightmost maps in the second diagram are induced by homotopy, and the map η in the first diagram is defined in Section 7.1.

Proof. Since the linearization of $\bar{\partial}$ is injective at both w_λ and u_λ , and since we can choose λ so that w_λ and u_λ are arbitrarily close to each other, we can find $\lambda_0 > 0$ and paths $u_s(\lambda)$, as described above, so that $\bar{\partial}_{u_s(\lambda)}$ is injective for all $0 \leq \lambda < \lambda_0$ and all $s \in [0, 1]$.

Now consider the vector bundles

$$\pi_2 : \mathcal{V}_2(\Gamma, \lambda) \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

$$\pi_1 : \mathcal{V}_1(\Gamma, \lambda) \rightarrow [0, 1]$$

with fibers

$$\pi_2^{-1}(s) := \mathcal{V}_{2,s,\lambda}[\Gamma] = \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[u_s(\lambda)](\Delta_{m+1}(\kappa_s, \lambda), u_s(\lambda)^* TT^* M)$$

and

$$\pi_1^{-1}(s) := \mathcal{V}_{1,s,\lambda}[\Gamma] = \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0](\Delta_{m+1}(\kappa_s, \lambda), T^{*0,1} \Delta_{m+1}(\kappa_s, \lambda) \otimes u_s(\lambda)^* TT^* M),$$

respectively. Here the weight $\mathbf{w}_\mu$ a priori depends on s , but we can think of it as being approximately 1 on compact parts of the standard domains, where ϕ_s has its support, and defined as in Section 6.1.A at the infinities.

We define trivializations

$$\hat{\Phi} : \mathcal{V}_2(\Gamma, \lambda) \rightarrow [0, 1] \times \mathcal{V}_{2,0,\lambda}[\Gamma]$$

and

$$\hat{\Psi} : \mathcal{V}_1(\Gamma, \lambda) \rightarrow [0, 1] \times \mathcal{V}_{1,0,\lambda}[\Gamma]$$

given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Phi}_s : \mathcal{V}_{2,s,\lambda}[\Gamma] &\rightarrow [0, 1] \times \mathcal{V}_{2,0,\lambda}[\Gamma] \\
g &\mapsto (s, A_{0,\lambda}(A_{s,\lambda} \circ \phi_s)^{-1} \cdot g \circ \phi_s)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Psi}_s : \mathcal{V}_{1,s,\lambda}[\Gamma] &\rightarrow [0, 1] \times \mathcal{V}_{1,0,\lambda}[\Gamma] \\
\alpha \otimes g &\mapsto (s, A_{0,\lambda}(A_{s,\lambda} \circ \phi_s)^{-1} \cdot \phi_s^* \alpha \otimes g \circ \phi_s).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the restriction of the fully linearized $\bar{\partial}$ -operator $D\bar{\partial}_J(u_s(\lambda), \kappa_s(\lambda))$ to $\mathcal{V}_{2,s,\lambda}[\Gamma]$, and we want to prove that this gives a bundle map

$$\bar{\partial}_J : \mathcal{V}_2(\Gamma, \lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_1(\Gamma, \lambda).$$

To prove this we need to compute the expression for

$$\bar{\partial}_{s,\lambda} := \hat{\Psi}_s \circ D\bar{\partial}_J(u_s(\lambda)) \circ \hat{\Phi}_s^{-1} : \mathcal{V}_{2,0,\lambda}[\Gamma] \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_{1,0,\lambda}[\Gamma]$$

and prove that it varies continuously with s . Using the bundle-trivializations above we get that

$$\bar{\partial}_{s,\lambda}(g) = dg + J \circ dg \circ j_{s,\lambda} + L_{A_{s,\lambda}}g$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} j_{s,\lambda} &= D\phi_{-s} \circ i \circ D\phi_s \\ L_{A_{s,\lambda}}g &= A_{0,\lambda}(A_{s,\lambda} \circ \phi_s)^{-1} \phi_s^* \bar{\partial}((A_{s,\lambda}(A_{0,\lambda} \circ \phi_{-s})^{-1}) \otimes g \end{aligned}$$

To prove that $\bar{\partial}_s$ depends continuously on s we must estimate $\|(\bar{\partial}_{s_1,\lambda} - \bar{\partial}_{s_2,\lambda})g\|_{\mathcal{V}_1}$ for $g \in \mathcal{V}_{2,0,\lambda}$. To simplify notation we neglect the λ -dependence, and we also let

$$\begin{aligned} A_\phi(s) &= A_0(A_s \circ \phi_s)^{-1}, \\ A_{-\phi}(s) &= A_s(A_0 \circ \phi_{-s})^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(\bar{\partial}_{s_1} - \bar{\partial}_{s_2})g\|_{\mathcal{V}_1} \\ &\leq \|J \circ dg \circ (j_{s_1} - j_{s_2})\|_{\mathcal{V}_1} + \left\| \left(A_\phi(s_1) \phi_{s_1}^* \bar{\partial} A_{-\phi}(s_1) - A_\phi(s_2) \phi_{s_2}^* \bar{\partial} A_{-\phi}(s_2) \right) \otimes g \right\|_{\mathcal{V}_1}. \end{aligned}$$

We begin with the estimate for the first expression, and we assume that $s_2 > s_1$. We use the group-structure of the flow ϕ_s so that $\phi_{s_2} = \phi_\epsilon \circ \phi_{s_1}$ for $\epsilon = s_2 - s_1$. For the first summand we then get

$$\|J \circ dg \circ (j_{s_1} - j_{s_2})\|_{\mathcal{V}_1} \leq \|J\|_{C^1} \cdot \|g\|_{\mathcal{V}_2} \cdot \|j_{s_1} - j_{s_2}\|_{C^1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|j_{s_1} - j_{s_2}\|_{C^1} &= \|D\phi_{-s_1} \circ (i - D\phi_{-\epsilon} \circ i \circ D\phi_\epsilon) \circ D\phi_{s_1}\|_{C^1} \\ &\leq C \cdot \|D\phi_{s_1}\|_{C^1}^2 \cdot (\|i - D\phi_{-\epsilon} \circ i\|_{C^1} + \|D\phi_{-\epsilon} \circ i\|_{C^1} \cdot \|\text{id} - D\phi_\epsilon\|_{C^1}) \\ &= C \cdot (1 + \mathcal{O}(s_1))^2 \cdot (\mathcal{O}(\epsilon) + (1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)) \cdot \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

It remains to estimate the second term. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} &\|(A_\phi(s_1) \phi_{s_1}^* \bar{\partial}(A_{-\phi}(s_1)) - A_\phi(s_2) \phi_{s_2}^* \bar{\partial}(A_{-\phi}(s_2))) \otimes g\|_{\mathcal{V}_1} \\ &\quad \tilde{C} \cdot \left(\|A_\phi(s_1)\|_{C^1} \|D\phi_{s_1}\|_{C^1} \cdot (\|A_{s_1} \circ \phi_{s_1}(A_0)^{-1} - A_{s_2} \circ \phi_{s_2}(A_0)^{-1}\|_{C^2} \right. \\ &\quad \quad \left. + \|\bar{\partial}(A_{s_2} \circ \phi_{s_2}(A_0)^{-1}) - \phi_\epsilon^* \bar{\partial}(A_{s_2} \circ \phi_{s_1}(A_0 \circ \phi_{-\epsilon})^{-1})\|_{C^1} \right) \\ &\quad \quad \left. + D \cdot \|((A_{s_1} \circ \phi_{s_1})^{-1} - (A_{s_2} \circ \phi_{s_2})^{-1})\|_{C^1} \cdot \|D\phi_{s_2}\|_{C^1} \right) \\ &\leq E \left(\|(A_{s_1} \circ \phi_{s_1})^{-1} - (A_{s_2} \circ \phi_{s_2})^{-1}\|_{C^2} ((2 + \mathcal{O}(s_1) + \mathcal{O}(s_2))) \right. \\ &\quad \quad \left. + \|A_{s_2} \circ \phi_{s_2}(A_0^{-1})\|_{C^2} \cdot \|\text{id} - D\phi_\epsilon\|_{C^1} \right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

Hence $\bar{\partial}_J$ gives a bundle map, and since the dimension of the cokernel of $\bar{\partial}_{s,\lambda}$ is constant in s it follows from standard Fredholm arguments that we have a vector

bundle $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_J$ over $[0, 1]$, with fibers $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{s,\lambda}$. Choose a trivialization and let $\hat{\chi}_1 : \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{0,\lambda} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{1,\lambda}$ be the induced linear map.

Now apply the arguments from Proposition 6.9 on this vector bundle to get that the map $\chi = \hat{\Psi}_1^{-1} \circ \hat{\chi}_1$ satisfies the requirements of the lemma. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Proposition 8.20 implies that the capping orientation $\mathcal{O}_s(w_\lambda)$ of the pre-glued disk w_λ of Γ coincides with the sign $\sigma_s(\Gamma)$ if λ is sufficiently small. Lemma 8.22 implies that there is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that $\mathcal{O}_s(w_\lambda) = \mathcal{O}_s(u_\lambda)$ for all $\lambda < \lambda_0$. $\square$

9. STABILIZATION - ANALYTICAL DETAILS

Next follows some lemmas which will be proven inductively, all at one time, and which imply the statements of lemmas 7.10 – 7.12, and also the part of Lemma 7.8 that remains to be proven.

Let $\phi_{\text{cap}}^\lambda$ and ϕ_t^λ be cut-off functions used when gluing the capping disks of Γ to the domain of Γ . We assume that $\phi_{\text{cap}}^\lambda$ have support in the regions of the glued domain corresponding to the capping disks, and that ϕ_t^λ have support in the region corresponding to $\Delta(\Gamma)$. We also assume that $|D^k(\phi_t^\lambda)| = O(\lambda)$, $k = 1, 2$, and that the same thing holds for $\phi_{\text{cap}}^\lambda$.

If $v \in \text{cap}(\Gamma) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$, will repetitively use something we call the *prolongation* of v , which is a vector $v^f = v + u$, $u \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\hat{\Gamma}] \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$, satisfying $\bar{\partial}v^f = 0$.

Lemma 9.1. *There is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that for each $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ there are vectors $\tilde{b}_1^\lambda, \dots, \tilde{b}_{k_1}^\lambda \in \text{cap}(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, $\tilde{w}_1^\lambda, \dots, \tilde{w}_{k_1}^\lambda \in V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ so that*

(c.1) *for $\Gamma' \supseteq \Gamma$ a (sub) flow tree we have*

$$\psi_{\text{Coker}_{\Gamma'}}(\tilde{b}_i^\lambda) = \psi_{\text{Coker}_{\Gamma'}}(\tilde{w}_i^\lambda), \quad i = 1, \dots, k_1,$$

(c.2) *the tuple $(\tilde{w}_1^\lambda, \dots, \tilde{w}_{k_1}^\lambda)$ gives a basis for $V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, and can be chosen continuously in λ with respect to the topology of $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$,*

(c.3) *the collection $\bigcup_{\lambda \in (0, \lambda_0]} \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda)$, where $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda) = \text{Span}(\tilde{b}_1^\lambda, \dots, \tilde{b}_{k_1}^\lambda)$, defines a sub-bundle $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma)$ of $\text{cap}(\Gamma) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$,*

(c.4) *the map*

$$\psi_{\text{Coker}_{\Gamma_\lambda}} : \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow \text{Coker}(\Gamma_\lambda)$$

is an isomorphism.

Lemma 9.2. *Assume that Γ is a sub flow tree with special puncture p . Then there is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that for each $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ there are vectors $\check{b}_1^\lambda, \dots, \check{b}_{k_2}^\lambda \in \text{cap}(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, $\check{w}_1^\lambda, \dots, \check{w}_{k_2}^\lambda \in V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, and continuous families of vectors $\check{u}_1^\lambda, \dots, \check{u}_{k_2}^\lambda, \check{k}_1^\lambda, \dots, \check{k}_{k_2}^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, $r_1^\lambda, \dots, r_{k_2}^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda]$ with $\|r_i^\lambda\|_{2,\mu} = O(\lambda)$, so that if we let the prolongations of $\check{b}_i$ and $\check{w}_i$ be defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} \check{b}_i^{f,\lambda} &= \phi_{\text{cap}}^\lambda \check{b}_i^\lambda + \phi_t^\lambda \check{u}_i^\lambda + r_i^\lambda, & i = 1, \dots, k_2, \\ \check{w}_i^{f,\lambda} &= \check{w}_i^\lambda + \check{k}_i^\lambda, & i = 1, \dots, k_2, \end{aligned}$$

then

(v.1) for $\Gamma' \supseteq \Gamma$ a (sub) flow tree we have

$$\psi_{\text{Coker}_{\Gamma'}}(\check{b}_i) = \psi_{\text{Coker}_{\Gamma'}}(\check{w}_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, k_2,$$

(v.2) $\check{b}_i^{f,\lambda}, \check{w}_i^{f,\lambda} \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}$, $i = 1, \dots, k_2$,

(v.3) the prolonged vectors satisfy

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(\check{b}_i^{f,\lambda}) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_p(\check{w}_i^{f,\lambda}), \quad i = 1, \dots, k_2,$$

(v.4) the tuple $(\check{w}_1^\lambda, \dots, \check{w}_{k_2+l_2}^\lambda)$ gives a basis for $V_{\text{con},v,\text{pre}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, and can be chosen continuously in λ with respect to the topology of $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$,

(v.5) the collection $\bigcup_{\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0]} \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_\lambda)$, where $\text{cap}_v(\Gamma_\lambda) = \text{Span}(\check{b}_1^\lambda, \dots, \check{b}_{k_1}^\lambda)$, defines a sub-bundle $\text{cap}_v(\Gamma)$ of $\text{cap}(\Gamma) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$,

(v.6) there is an isomorphism

$$\text{cap}_v(\Gamma) \simeq V_{\text{con},v,\text{pre}}(\Gamma) \simeq \text{VirKer}_{\text{pre}}(\Gamma)$$

given by (v.3).

Lemma 9.3. *There is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that for each $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ there are vectors $\hat{b}_1^\lambda, \dots, \hat{b}_{k_3}^\lambda \in \text{cap}(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ and continuous families of vectors $\hat{u}_1^\lambda, \dots, \hat{u}_{k_3}^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda] \oplus V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_\lambda)$, $r_1^\lambda, \dots, r_{k_3}^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda]$ with $\|r_i^\lambda\|_{2,\mu} = O(\lambda)$, so that if we let the prolongations of $\hat{b}_i$ be defined by*

$$\hat{b}_i^{f,\lambda} = \phi_{\text{cap}}^\lambda \hat{b}_i^\lambda + \phi_t^\lambda \cdot (\hat{u}_i^\lambda + r_i^\lambda), \quad i = 1, \dots, k_3,$$

then

(k.1) $\hat{b}_i^f \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}$,

(k.2) the collection $\bigcup_{\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0]} \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_\lambda)$, where $\text{cap}_k(\Gamma_\lambda) = \text{Span}(\hat{b}_1^\lambda, \dots, \hat{b}_{k_3}^\lambda)$, defines a subbundle $\text{cap}_k(\Gamma)$ of $\text{cap}(\Gamma) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma)$,

(k.3) $\text{cap}(\Gamma) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) = \text{cap}_c(\Gamma) \oplus \text{cap}_v(\Gamma) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma)$,

(k.4) we have an isomorphism

$$(9.1) \quad \text{Ker}(\hat{\Gamma}_{c,\lambda}) \simeq \mathbb{R}^n \simeq \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda} \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_\lambda)$$

given by evaluation of $\text{Ker } \hat{\Gamma}_{c,\lambda}$, $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda}$, and the prolonged vectors $\hat{b}_i^{f,\lambda}, \check{w}_i^{f,\lambda}$ at a special puncture of Γ if Γ is a sub flow tree, or at the positive puncture of Γ if Γ is a rigid flow tree, and taking the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma 9.4. *The lemmas 9.1 – 9.3 also hold when replacing $V_{\text{con},\text{pre}}(\Gamma)$ with $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$.*

Proof of Lemma 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4. We prove this using induction.

Step 1, the Lemmata 9.1-9.4 hold for elementary trees. First we notice that the statements in Lemma 9.1, 9.2 and 9.4 are trivially satisfied. We prove that the statements in Lemma 9.3 hold for each type of elementary trees Γ , case by case.

1-pieces: Let p be the positive puncture of Γ , and let q be the negative puncture. We assume that one of them is special. Note that $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma) = \emptyset$.

For each λ sufficiently small we pick a basis $(\hat{b}_1^\lambda, \dots, \hat{b}_k^\lambda)$ for $\text{cap}(\Gamma_\lambda)$. By Lemma 8.5 we can choose the bases so that they give rise to a trivialized

bundle $\text{cap}_k(\Gamma) = \text{cap}(\Gamma)$. Thus the statements (k.2) and (k.3) in Lemma 9.3 are satisfied. To prove also (k.1) and (k.4), consider the case when p is a special positive puncture and q is a true negative puncture, the other case is similar. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{w}} = \tilde{\mathbf{w}}_{\bar{\mu}}$ be the weight $\mathbf{w}$ defined on $\Delta(\Gamma)$, modified to be asymptotic to $e^{-\delta|\tau|}$ in all directions, and consider the $\bar{\partial}$ -problem

$$\bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mu}\lambda} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\bar{\mu}}[\Gamma_\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\bar{\mu}}[\Gamma_\lambda].$$

This problem is a surjective Fredholm problem with n -dimensional kernel for λ small enough. Moreover, $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mu}\lambda}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^n$ in the limit and give rise to a bundle $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mu}}$ over $[0, \lambda_0]$ for λ_0 sufficiently small.

Now for each $i = 1, \dots, k$ let $\hat{u}_i^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\bar{\mu}\lambda}$ be a continuous family of vectors such that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_q(\hat{u}_i^\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_q(\hat{b}_i^\lambda)$. By arguments as in the proof of Proposition 6.9 it follows that there exist $r_i^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\hat{\Gamma}_\lambda]$ with support in the gluing region, satisfying $\|r_i^\lambda\|_{2,\mu} = O(\lambda)$ and so that

$$\bar{\partial}(\phi_t^\lambda \hat{u}_i^\lambda + \phi_{\text{cap}}^\lambda \hat{b}_i^\lambda + r_i^\lambda) = 0.$$

Now set

$$\hat{b}_i^{f,\lambda} = \phi_t^\lambda \hat{u}_i^\lambda + \phi_{\text{cap}}^\lambda \hat{b}_i^\lambda + r_i^\lambda.$$

Then the statement (k.1) follows, and the statement (k.4) follows from the exact sequence (8.8) and the fact that $\text{VirKer}(\Gamma)$ is trivial.

2-pieces: This is similar to the case of 1-pieces.

Y_0 -pieces: Here also the statements in Lemma 9.3 are trivial.

end-pieces: Here also the statements in Lemma 9.3 are trivial.

switch-pieces: Recall the definition of the cusp-stabilization vector v_s^λ associated to the switch s . Since the weight vector associated to the switch-piece is negative at both infinities it follows that the vector $\hat{u}^\lambda = (1 - \phi_s^\lambda)\partial_{x_n}$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}(\Gamma_s)$, and clearly if we set $e^\lambda = v_s^\lambda$, $e^{f,\lambda} = \hat{u}^\lambda + e^\lambda$ then the statements of Lemma 9.3 hold.

Y_1 -pieces: This is similar to the case of switch-pieces.

Step 2, the Lemmata 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4 hold for the following sub flow trees.

- a) Trees consisting of one Y_0 -vertex, two true negative punctures and one special positive puncture.
- b) Trees consisting of one negative 2-valent puncture, one true negative puncture and one special positive puncture.
- c) Trees consisting of one switch-vertex, one true puncture and one special puncture.
- d) Trees consisting of one Y_1 -vertex, two true negative punctures and one special positive puncture.

We prove the cases one at a time. Note that Lemma 9.1 is trivially satisfied for all cases.

a) – Y_0 : Again we use an inductive process to prove the statement, by gluing two elementary 1-pieces Γ_1 and Γ_2 to a Y_0 -piece Γ_v with 3-valent vertex v . Let p_0 denote the positive special puncture of Γ_v , and let p_i be the negative special

puncture at which Γ_i is attached, $i = 1, 2$. Let e_i be the edge of Γ_v between v and p_i , $i = 0, 1, 2$. Consider the flow direction f_0 of Γ_{12} at v , directed towards the positive puncture, and the flow directions f_1, f_2 directed toward the vertex v along e_1 and e_2 , respectively. Recall that we might assume that the boundary conditions induced by Λ are covariantly constant in a neighborhood of v , and that we have flat coordinates. Also recall that the boundary conditions tend to constant $\mathbb{R}^n$ -conditions as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Let v_j denote the covariantly constant vector field defined on Γ_v which are directed as f_j at v , $j = 0, 1, 2$.

We start by proving Lemma 9.2 in the stabilized case, i.e., with $V_{\text{con,pre}}(\Gamma)$ replaced by $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$. From Lemma A.8 it follows that the operator

$$\bar{\partial} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_{v,\lambda}] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_{v,\lambda}]$$

is Fredholm of index n with n -dimensional kernel isomorphic to $T_v M$ via evaluation in the limit. Let $w = \check{w}_\lambda$ denote the conformal variation which corresponds to moving the slit associated to v . Then the extended operator $\bar{\partial}_s : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_{v,\lambda}] \oplus \text{Span}(\check{w}_\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[\Gamma_{v,\lambda}]$ is Fredholm of index $n + 1$ with $n + 1$ -dimensional kernel. It follows that there exists a $\check{k}_0^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_{v,\lambda}]$ such that $\bar{\partial}(\check{w}^\lambda + \check{k}_0^\lambda) = 0$. Moreover, by the asymptotic behavior of $\check{w}^\lambda$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ it follows that we can choose $\check{k}_0^\lambda$ continuously in λ so that $\check{k}_0^\lambda \rightarrow v_0(p_0) + v_1(p_1) + v_2(p_2)$, where $u(p)$ is the vector field u supported in a neighborhood of p . Moreover, let $v_0^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{v,\lambda}}$ so that $v_0^\lambda \rightarrow v_0$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Then, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\check{k}_0^\lambda = v_0^\lambda$ in a neighborhood of p .

By transversality and the asymptotic behavior of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{i,\lambda}}$, $i = 1, 2$, it follows that there exists $\check{k}_i^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{i,\lambda}}$ such that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_{p_i}(\check{k}_i^\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_v(\check{k}_i^\lambda).$$

Let $\phi_i^\lambda : \Delta(\Gamma_\lambda) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2, v$, be cut-off functions as in Proposition 6.9, supported on the part of $\Delta(\Gamma)$ corresponding to Γ_i , and so that $\phi_1^\lambda + \phi_2^\lambda + \phi_v^\lambda = 1$, $|D^k \phi_i^\lambda| = O(\lambda)$, $k = 1, 2$. By the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 6.9 there are $\check{r}_i^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ satisfying $|\check{r}_i^\lambda|_{2,\mu} = O(\lambda)$ and so that

$$\bar{\partial}(\phi_1^\lambda \check{k}_1^\lambda + \phi_2^\lambda \check{k}_2^\lambda + \phi_v^\lambda \cdot (\check{k}_0^\lambda + \check{w}^\lambda) + \check{r}_i^\lambda) = 0.$$

We set

$$\check{w}_i^{f,\lambda} = \phi_1^\lambda \check{k}_1^\lambda + \phi_2^\lambda \check{k}_2^\lambda + \phi_v^\lambda \cdot (\check{k}_0^\lambda + \check{w}^\lambda) + \check{r}_i^\lambda.$$

Then the statement (v.4) is satisfied, with $V_{\text{con},v,\text{pre}}(\Gamma)$ replaced by $V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma)$, and we also get that $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma) = V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma) \simeq \text{VirKer}(\Gamma)$.

To find the vector $\check{b}^\lambda \in \text{cap}(\Gamma_\lambda)$ corresponding to $\check{w}^\lambda$, and also the prolonged vector $\check{b}^f$, we recall that by Step 1 and by transversality in the limit we have

$$(9.2) \quad \text{Ker}(\Gamma_i) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_i) \simeq \mathbb{R}^n, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_2) \oplus \text{Ker}(\Gamma_{ps}) \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$$

via evaluation at p_1 and p_2 in the limit, using the prolonged versions of the capping vectors and the canonical identification of tangent spaces of M with $\mathbb{R}^n$ over Γ_v .

Consider the vector v_0 defined above. By the identification (9.2) there are continuous families of vectors $b^\lambda \in \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_{1,\lambda})$, $c^\lambda \in \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_{2,\lambda})$, $\check{u}_i^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{i,\lambda}}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_{p_1}(b^{f,\lambda} + \check{u}_1^\lambda) &= \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_{p_1}(v_0^\lambda), \\ \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_{p_2}(c^{f,\lambda} + \check{u}_2^\lambda) &= \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_{p_2}(v_0^\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where $b^{f,\lambda}$ is the prolonged vector corresponding to b^λ from Step 1, and similar for $c^{f,\lambda}$. Note that we have $b^\lambda + c^\lambda \neq 0$ by rigidity.

Again, using the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 6.9 there are functions $\check{r}^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ satisfying $\|\check{r}^\lambda\|_{2,\mu} = O(\lambda)$ and so that

$$\bar{\partial}(\phi_v^\lambda v_0^\lambda + \phi_1^\lambda \cdot (\check{u}_1^\lambda + b^{f,\lambda}) + \phi_2^\lambda \cdot (\check{u}_2^\lambda + c^{f,\lambda}) + \check{r}^\lambda) = 0.$$

Now set

$$\begin{aligned} \check{d}_1^\lambda &= b^\lambda + c^\lambda \\ \check{d}_1^f &= \phi_v^\lambda v_0^\lambda + \phi_1^\lambda \cdot (\check{u}_1^\lambda + b^{f,\lambda}) + \phi_2^\lambda \cdot (\check{u}_2^\lambda + c^{f,\lambda}) + \check{r}^\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Then the statements (v.2), (v.3), (v.4), (v.5) and (v.6) of Lemma 9.2 are satisfied. To prove also the statement (v.1), note that if $\Gamma' \supset \Gamma$ is a (sub) flow tree then we must cut off $\check{d}_1^{f,\lambda}$ and $\check{w}^{f,\lambda}$ to be defined on $\Delta(\Gamma')$, with a cut-off function β , say, supported on the part of $\Delta(\Gamma')$ corresponding to $\Delta(\Gamma)$. Then we get

$$\bar{\partial}(\beta \check{w}^{f,\lambda}) = \bar{\partial}(\beta v_0^\lambda) = \bar{\partial}(\beta \check{d}_1^{f,\lambda})$$

and hence

$$\text{Proj}_{\text{Coker}(\Gamma')}(\bar{\partial}(\check{w}^\lambda - \phi_{\text{cap}}^\lambda \check{d}_i^\lambda)) = \text{Proj}_{\text{Coker}(\Gamma')}(\bar{\partial}(\beta \check{w}^{f,\lambda} - \beta \check{d}_i^{f,\lambda})) = 0$$

where the first equality follows from the fact that $\beta \check{w}^{f,\lambda} - \check{w}^\lambda, \beta \check{d}_i^{f,\lambda} - \phi_{\text{cap}}^\lambda \check{d}_i^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma']$.

To prove Lemma 9.3, let $\hat{u}_1^\lambda, \dots, \hat{u}_k^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{v,\lambda}}$ be a continuous family of vectors satisfying

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_v \text{Span}(\hat{u}_1^\lambda, \dots, \hat{u}_k^\lambda) \oplus \text{Span}(\text{ev}_v(\check{w}^{f,\lambda})) \oplus \text{Span}(\text{ev}_v(\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_\lambda})) \simeq \mathbb{R}^n.$$

By (9.2) there are $\hat{k}_{j,i}^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{j,\lambda}}$, $j = 1, 2$, and vectors $b_i^\lambda \in \text{cap}(\Gamma_{1,\lambda})$, $\hat{c}_i^\lambda \in \text{cap}(\Gamma_{2,\lambda})$ such that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_v(\hat{k}_{1,i}^\lambda + \hat{b}_i^{f,\lambda}) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_v(\hat{u}_i^\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_v(\hat{k}_{2,i}^\lambda + \hat{c}_i^{f,\lambda}), \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

Again, there are $\hat{r}_i^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ satisfying $\|\hat{r}_i^\lambda\|_{2,\mu} = O(\lambda)$ so that

$$\bar{\partial}(\phi_v^\lambda \hat{u}_i^\lambda + \phi_1^\lambda \cdot (\hat{k}_{1,i}^\lambda + \hat{b}_i^{f,\lambda}) + \phi_2^\lambda \cdot (\hat{k}_{2,i}^\lambda + \hat{c}_i^{f,\lambda}) + \hat{r}_i^\lambda) = 0.$$

Let

$$\hat{d}_i^\lambda = \hat{b}_i^\lambda + \hat{c}_i^\lambda$$

and

$$\hat{d}_i^{f,\lambda} = \phi_v^\lambda \hat{u}_i^\lambda + \phi_1^\lambda \cdot (\hat{k}_{1,i}^\lambda + \hat{b}_i^{f,\lambda}) + \phi_2^\lambda \cdot (\hat{k}_{2,i}^\lambda + \hat{c}_i^{f,\lambda}) + \hat{r}_i^\lambda.$$

If we now put $\text{cap}_k(\Gamma_\lambda) = \text{Span}(\hat{d}_1^\lambda, \dots, \hat{d}_m^\lambda)$ then the statements in Lemma 9.3 follow, and hence Step 2 is proven in case a).

- b) – *2-valent negative puncture*: This is similar to case a). Note that we have $\text{cap}(\Gamma_1) = 0$, $\text{cap}(\Gamma_2) = \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_2) \simeq \mathbb{R}^n$.
- c) – *switch*: In this case also Lemma 9.2 is trivial, and the only thing which remains to prove is Lemma 9.3.

We consider the case when Γ has a true negative puncture p and a special positive puncture. The other case is similar. Thus, we might assume that $\Gamma = \Gamma_2 \#_q \Gamma_1$ where Γ_2 is an elementary tree with switch s and negative special puncture q , and Γ_1 is an elementary tree with p as a true negative puncture and special positive puncture q . Let $\text{cap}(\Gamma_{1,\lambda}) = \text{Span}(\hat{b}_1^\lambda, \dots, \hat{b}_k^\lambda)$, $\mathcal{E}(\Gamma_{2,\lambda}) = \text{Span}(\hat{v}^\lambda)$. We claim that $\text{cap}(\Gamma) = \text{cap}_k(\Gamma) = \text{cap}(\Gamma_1) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_2)$.

Indeed, let $\hat{b}_1^{f,\lambda}, \dots, \hat{b}_k^{f,\lambda}$ and $\hat{v}^{f,\lambda}$ be the prolongations of $\hat{b}_1^\lambda, \dots, \hat{b}_k^\lambda$ and $\hat{v}^\lambda$, respectively, as in Step 1. By transversality there is a continuous choice of $u_\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,\lambda}}$ so that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_q(u_\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_q(\hat{v}^{f,\lambda}).$$

By the same arguments as above, there is a $\hat{r}^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ satisfying $\|\hat{r}^\lambda\|_{2,\mu} = O(\lambda)$ and so that

$$\bar{\partial}(\phi_s^\lambda \hat{v}^{f,\lambda} + \phi_1^\lambda u_\lambda + \hat{r}^\lambda) = 0,$$

where ϕ_i^λ , $i = 1, 2$, are the cut-off functions having support on $\Delta(\Gamma_i)$, which were used when gluing Γ_2 to Γ_1 . Let

$$\hat{d}_1^\lambda = \hat{v}^\lambda$$

and let

$$\hat{d}_1^{f,\lambda} = \phi_2^\lambda \hat{v}^{f,\lambda} + \phi_1^\lambda u_\lambda + \hat{r}^\lambda.$$

To find the remaining parts of $\text{cap}_k(\Gamma)$, note that again by transversality and by the inductive assumptions we have

$$(9.3) \quad \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_{1,\lambda}) \oplus \text{Ker}(\Gamma_{1,\lambda}) \simeq T_q M, \quad \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_{2,\lambda}) \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,\lambda}} \simeq T_q M$$

via evaluation in the limit. Hence there are vectors $\hat{u}_1^\lambda, \dots, \hat{u}_k^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,\lambda}}$ so that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_q(\hat{u}_i^\lambda) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_q(\hat{b}_i^{f,\lambda}), \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

Using the same arguments as above there are vectors $\hat{r}_i^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$, $\|\hat{r}_i^\lambda\|_{2,\mu} = O(\lambda)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, so that

$$\bar{\partial}(\phi_s^\lambda \hat{u}_i^\lambda + \phi_s^\lambda \hat{b}_i^{f,\lambda} + \hat{r}_i^\lambda) = 0.$$

Thus, if we let

$$\hat{d}_{i+1}^\lambda = \hat{b}_i^\lambda, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

and

$$\hat{d}_{i+1}^{f,\lambda} = \phi_s^\lambda \hat{u}_i^\lambda + \phi_s^\lambda \hat{b}_i^{f,\lambda} + \hat{r}_i^\lambda, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

we see that, with $\text{cap}_k(\Gamma) = \text{Span}(\hat{d}_1, \dots, \hat{d}_{k+1})$, the statements (k.1), (k.2) and (k.3) hold. Also, via evaluation at the positive puncture of Γ we get that (k.4) holds.

d) – Y_1 : This is similar to the Y_0 -case, and we use the notation from there. The main difference in this case is that $\text{cap}_v(\Gamma_\lambda) = \text{Span}(v_v^\lambda)$, where v_v is the cusp-stabilization of the Y_1 -vertex v .

The construction of $\check{w}_i^{f,\lambda}$ is completely similar to the Y_0 -case, the only difference is that the vector $\check{k}_0^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_{v,\lambda}]$ satisfying $\bar{\partial}(\check{w}^\lambda + \check{k}_0^\lambda) = 0$ is assumed to coincide with the prolonged version $\hat{v}^{f,\lambda}$ of v_v^λ in a neighborhood of p_0 .

Now we show that $\text{cap}_v(\Gamma_\lambda) = \text{Span}(v_v^\lambda)$. To do this, we must find a prolongation $\check{d}_1^{f,\lambda}$ of $\check{d}_1^\lambda = v_v^\lambda$, corresponding to $\check{w}^{f,\lambda}$ in the statement (v.3). Using identifications similar to (9.2) and (9.3), together with our transversality assumption and parallel transport we get that

$$(9.4) \quad \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_2) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_v) \oplus \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \simeq \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and that there are continuous families of vectors $\check{u}_i^\lambda \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{i,\lambda}}$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_{p_1}(\check{u}_1^\lambda) &= \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_{p_1}(\hat{v}^{f,\lambda}) \\ \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_{p_2}(\check{u}_2^\lambda) &= \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_{p_2}(\hat{v}^{f,\lambda}). \end{aligned}$$

Again, using arguments as in the proof of Proposition 6.9 there are functions $\check{r}^\lambda \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$ satisfying $\|\check{r}^\lambda\|_{2,\mu} = O(\lambda)$ and so that

$$\bar{\partial}(\phi_v^\lambda \hat{v}^{f,\lambda} + \phi_1^\lambda(\check{u}_1^\lambda) + \phi_2^\lambda(\check{u}_2^\lambda) + \check{r}^\lambda) = 0.$$

Now set

$$\begin{aligned} \check{d}_1^\lambda &= v_v^\lambda \\ \check{d}_1^{f,\lambda} &= \phi_v^\lambda \hat{v}^{f,\lambda} + \phi_1^\lambda(\check{u}_1^\lambda) + \phi_2^\lambda(\check{u}_2^\lambda) + \check{r}^\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

and let

$$\text{cap}_v(\Gamma_\lambda) = \check{d}_1^\lambda.$$

Then the statements (v.2), (v.3), (v.5) and (v.6) of Lemma 9.2 are satisfied. The proof of the statement (v.1) is similar to the Y_0 -case.

To find the space $\text{cap}_k(\Gamma_\lambda)$ and the corresponding prolongations we proceed similar to the case of a Y_0 -vertex.

Step 3, the Lemmata 9.1 – 9.4 holds for all (sub) flow trees. We continue the induction, assuming that the lemmas 9.1 – 9.4 hold for all sub flow trees with at most k true vertices, and prove that the Lemmata 9.1 – 9.4 holds for trees with $k+1$ true punctures, obtained by one of the gluings (y0g) – (f2).

We prove the case of gluing at a Y_0 -vertex, and then point out the differences in the remaining cases.

(y0g) – *gluing at a Y_0 -vertex*: We use the same notation as in Step 2. Recall that, by induction, we may assume that

$$(9.5) \quad \mathbb{R}^n = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_i} \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_i) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_i), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

via evaluation of the prolonged vectors at p_i , letting $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Using covariantly constant vector fields over the Y_0 -piece as discussed above we can think of these spaces as intersecting at v in the limit. By transversality we have

$$(9.6) \quad \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \text{ev}_v(\text{cap}_k(\Gamma_{1,\lambda})) \cap \text{ev}_v(\text{cap}_k(\Gamma_{2,\lambda})) = 0,$$

again by evaluation of the prolonged vectors. Moreover, from the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} \\ \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} \\ \mathbb{R}^n \\ \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \rightarrow 0$$

we see that

$$(9.7) \quad \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_\Gamma \simeq \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} \oplus \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2} \oplus \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma, \text{new}}$$

where we can identify $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma, \text{new}}$ with a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ which is a complement of the image of $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} + \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2}$ under evaluation. Now, again working in the limit and using (9.5) to expand $\mathbb{R}^n$ as a direct sum, first for $i = 1$ and then for $i = 2$, we get

$$(9.8) \quad \text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma, \text{new}} \simeq (\text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1) \cap \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_2)) \oplus (\text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1) \cap \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_2)) \oplus (\text{cap}_k(\Gamma_1) \cap \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_2)),$$

$$(9.9) \quad \text{VirKer}(\Gamma)_{\text{pre}} \simeq (\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} \cap \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_2)) \oplus (\text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1) \cap \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2}) \oplus (\text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1) \cap \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_2)),$$

and by (9.6)

$$(9.10) \quad \text{cap}_k(\Gamma) \simeq ((\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_1} \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1)) \cap \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_2)) \oplus (\text{cap}_k(\Gamma_1) \cap (\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_2} \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_2))) \\ = \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_2).$$

Now we recall our induction hypothesis, i.e. the choice of subbundles $\text{cap}_v(\underline{\Gamma}_i)$, $\text{cap}_k(\underline{\Gamma}_i)$, $\text{cap}_c(\underline{\Gamma}_i) \subset \text{cap}(\underline{\Gamma}_i)$, $V_{\text{con},c}(\underline{\Gamma}_i)$, $V_{\text{con},v}(\underline{\Gamma}_i) \subset V_{\text{con}}(\underline{\Gamma}_i)$, with fibers satisfying

$$\text{cap}_c(\Gamma_i) \simeq \text{Coker}(\Gamma_i) \simeq V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma_i) \\ \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_i) \simeq \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_i) \simeq V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma_i)$$

for $i = 1, 2$ and for all λ sufficiently small dropped from the notation.

Now we use this to find the corresponding partition

$$\text{cap}_v(\Gamma) \oplus \text{cap}_c(\Gamma) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma) = \mathcal{E}(\Gamma) \oplus \text{cap}(\Gamma)$$

and

$$V_{\text{con},c}(\Gamma) \oplus V_{\text{con},v}(\Gamma) = V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma).$$

To that end, assume that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_1) &= \text{Span}(\check{b}_1, \dots, \check{b}_{k_1}) & \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_2) &= \text{Span}(\check{c}_1, \dots, \check{c}_{k_2}) \\ \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_1) &= \text{Span}(\tilde{b}_1, \dots, \tilde{b}_{l_1}) & \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_2) &= \text{Span}(\tilde{c}_1, \dots, \tilde{c}_{l_2}) \\ \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_1) &= \text{Span}(\hat{b}_1, \dots, \hat{b}_{m_1}) & \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_2) &= \text{Span}(\hat{c}_1, \dots, \hat{c}_{m_2}). \end{aligned}$$

To simplify notation, we denote by $w(\tilde{b}_i)$ the vector $\tilde{w}_i \in V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1)$ corresponding to $\tilde{b}_i$ under the identification in Lemma 9.1. Similarly we let $w(\tilde{c}_i)$ denote the vector $\tilde{w}_i \in V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2)$ corresponding to $\tilde{c}_i$. Also, we denote by $w(\check{b}_i), w^f(\check{b}_i)$ the vectors $\check{w}_i \in V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1)$, $\check{w}_i^f \in V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_1) \oplus \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_1]$ corresponding to $\check{b}_i$ and $\check{b}_i^f$, respectively, in Lemma 9.2. We let $w(\check{c}_i), w^f(\check{c}_i)$ denote the similar vectors $\check{w}_i \in V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2)$, $\check{w}_i^f \in V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma_2) \oplus \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_2]$ corresponding to $\check{c}_i$ and $\check{c}_i^f$.

To find $\text{cap}_k(\Gamma)$, we see that (9.10) implies that there are continuous families of vectors $u_i^{b,\lambda} \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,s,\lambda}}$, $u_i^{c,\lambda} \in \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,s,\lambda}}$, $c_i^{b,\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_{v,\lambda}]$ and $c_i^{c,\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_{v,\lambda}]$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ev}_{p_2}(u_i^b) &= \text{ev}_{p_2}(c_i^b) = \text{ev}_{p_1}(c_i^b) = \text{ev}_{p_1}(\hat{b}_i^f), \quad i = 1, \dots, m_1, \\ \text{ev}_{p_2}(u_i^c) &= \text{ev}_{p_2}(c_i^c) = \text{ev}_{p_1}(c_i^c) = \text{ev}_{p_1}(\hat{c}_i^f), \quad i = 1, \dots, m_2, \end{aligned}$$

via evaluation in the limit. Now recall that we have the identifications

$$\text{cap}_v(\Gamma_i) \simeq \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_i), \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Thus we can think of the part of the vectors $u_i^{b,\lambda}$, $u_i^{c,\lambda}$ sitting in $\text{VirKer}(\Gamma_{2,\lambda})$ and $\text{VirKer}(\Gamma_{1,\lambda})$, respectively, in two ways, either as linear combinations of vectors $\check{b}_i^{f,\lambda}$ ($\check{c}_i^{f,\lambda}$), or as linear combinations of vectors $w(\check{b}_i^{f,\lambda})$ ($w(\check{c}_i^{f,\lambda})$). When thinking of them as the latter, write $w^f(u_i^{b,\lambda})$ and $w^f(u_i^{c,\lambda})$, respectively, and let $w(u_i^{b,\lambda})$ and $w(u_i^{c,\lambda})$ denote their projection to $V_{\text{con}}(\Gamma)$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}_i^\lambda &= \hat{b}_i^\lambda + \text{Proj}_{\text{cap}(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda)}(u_i^{b,\lambda}) & i &= 1, \dots, m_1, \\ \hat{d}_i^\lambda &= \hat{c}_i^\lambda + \text{Proj}_{\text{cap}(\Gamma_\lambda) \oplus \mathcal{E}(\Gamma_\lambda)}(u_i^{c,\lambda}) & i &= m_1 + 1, \dots, m_1 + m_2. \end{aligned}$$

As above, we can find $r_i^{k,\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[\Gamma_\lambda]$, $\|r_i^{k,\lambda}\|_{2,\mu} = O(\lambda)$, $i = 1, \dots, m_1 + m_2$, $k = b, c$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}(\phi_1^\lambda \hat{b}_i^{f,\lambda} + \phi_2^\lambda u_i^{b,\lambda} + \phi_v^\lambda c_i^{b,\lambda} + r_i^{b,\lambda}) &= 0 & i &= 1, \dots, m_1, \\ \bar{\partial}(\phi_2^\lambda \hat{c}_i^{f,\lambda} + \phi_1^\lambda u_i^{c,\lambda} + \phi_v^\lambda c_i^{c,\lambda} + r_i^{c,\lambda}) &= 0 & i &= m_1 + 1, \dots, m_1 + m_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\text{cap}_k(\Gamma) = \text{Span}(\hat{d}_1, \dots, \hat{d}_{m_1+m_2})$ and let

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{d}_i^{f,\lambda} &= \phi_1^\lambda \hat{b}_i^{f,\lambda} + \phi_2^\lambda u_i^{b,\lambda} + \phi_v^\lambda c_i^{b,\lambda} + r_i^{b,\lambda}, & i &= 1, \dots, m_1, \\ \hat{d}_i^{f,\lambda} &= \phi_2^\lambda \hat{c}_i^{f,\lambda} + \phi_1^\lambda u_i^{c,\lambda} + \phi_v^\lambda c_i^{c,\lambda} + r_i^{c,\lambda}, & i &= m_1 + 1, \dots, m_1 + m_2. \end{aligned}$$

Then the statements (k.1) and (k.2) in Lemma 9.3 hold, and since the vectors c_i^b, c_i^c are covariantly constant we get that $\text{cap}_k(\Gamma) \simeq \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_2)$ via evaluation at p_0 in the limit, so statement (k.4) also holds by (9.10).

To find $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma)$, we use that this space splits as $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma)_{\text{old}} \oplus \text{cap}_c(\Gamma)_{\text{new}}$, where $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma)_{\text{old}}$ corresponds to $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_2)$, and $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma)_{\text{new}}$ corresponds to $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma, \text{new}}$. See equation (9.7).

We begin with the definition of $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda)_{\text{old}}$ for λ sufficiently small. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{d}_i^\lambda &= \tilde{b}_i^\lambda, & w(\tilde{d}_i)^\lambda &= w(\tilde{b}_i)^\lambda, & i &= 1, \dots, l_1, \\ \tilde{d}_{l_1+i}^\lambda &= \tilde{c}_i^\lambda, & w(\tilde{d}_{l_1+i})^\lambda &= w(\tilde{c}_i)^\lambda, & i &= 1, \dots, l_2, \end{aligned}$$

and put $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma)_{\text{old}} = \text{Span}(\tilde{d}_1, \dots, \tilde{d}_{l_1+l_2})$.

When defining $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma)_{\text{new}}$ it is natural to define $\text{cap}_v(\Gamma)$ at the same time, since from (9.8) and (9.9) we get

$$\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma, \text{new}} \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma)_{\text{pre}} \simeq \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_2).$$

To define $\text{cap}_v(\Gamma)$, let $\check{d}_1^\lambda, \dots, \check{d}_{j_1}^\lambda \in \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_\lambda) \simeq \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_{1,\lambda})$ such that

$$\text{Span}(\check{d}_1^\lambda, \dots, \check{d}_{j_1}^\lambda) \simeq \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{2,\lambda}} \cap \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_{1,\lambda})$$

using the prolongations and evaluation in the limit to identify these spaces. Then $\check{d}_i^\lambda = \sum \alpha_{i_j}^\lambda \check{b}_{i_j}^\lambda$ for some continuous families of $\alpha_{i_j}^\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and we let

$$w(\check{d}_i^\lambda) = \sum \alpha_{i_j}^\lambda w(\check{b}_{i_j}^\lambda), \quad i = 1, \dots, j_1.$$

To find the prolonged versions of the vectors just defined, we proceed as in Step 2.

Similarly, pick $\check{d}_{j_1+1}^\lambda, \dots, \check{d}_{j_1+j_2}^\lambda \in \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_{2,\lambda}) \simeq \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_{2,\lambda})$ continuous in λ such that

$$\text{Span}(\check{d}_{j_1+1}^\lambda, \dots, \check{d}_{j_1+j_2}^\lambda) \simeq \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_{1,\lambda}} \cap \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_{2,\lambda}),$$

and define $\check{d}_i^f, w(\check{d}_i), w^f(\check{d}_i)$ in a similar manner as above for $i = j_1+1, \dots, j_1+j_2$.

Next let $\check{d}_{j_1+j_2+1}^\lambda, \dots, \check{d}_{k_3}^\lambda \in \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_2) \oplus \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_2)$ such that

$$\text{Span}(\check{d}_{j_1+j_2+1}^\lambda, \dots, \check{d}_{k_3}^\lambda) \simeq \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_1) \cap \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_2).$$

Then $\check{d}_i^\lambda = \sum \alpha_{i_j}^\lambda \check{b}_{i_j}^\lambda + \beta_{i_k}^\lambda \check{c}_{i_k}^\lambda$ for some $\alpha_{i_j}^\lambda, \beta_{i_k}^\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, depending continuously on λ . We let

$$w(\check{d}_i^\lambda) = \sum \alpha_{i_j}^\lambda w(\check{b}_{i_j}^\lambda) + \beta_{i_k}^\lambda w(\check{c}_{i_k}^\lambda).$$

To find the prolonged versions, we proceed as when we prolonged the vectors in $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma)$.

Hence, if we let $\text{cap}_v(\Gamma) = \text{Span}(\check{d}_1, \dots, \check{d}_{k_3})$ then the statements (v.2) – (v.6) in 9.2 hold. Thus it remains to prove statement (v.1), but this follows similar to Step 2.

To find $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma)_{\text{new}}$, pick $\tilde{d}_{l_1+l_2+1}^\lambda, \dots, \tilde{d}_{l_1+l_2+l_3}^\lambda \in \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_{1,\lambda}) \oplus \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_{2,\lambda})$ and put $\text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda)_{\text{new}} = \text{Span}(\tilde{d}_{l_1+l_2+1}^\lambda, \dots, \tilde{d}_{l_1+l_2+l_3}^\lambda)$ where we make the choice so that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda)_{\text{old}} \oplus \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_\lambda)_{\text{new}} \oplus \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_\lambda) \\ = \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_{1,\lambda}) \oplus \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_{2,\lambda}) \oplus \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_{2,\lambda}) \oplus \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_{2,\lambda}). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\tilde{d}_i^\lambda = \sum_{j,k} \alpha_{i_j}^\lambda \check{b}_{i_j}^\lambda + \beta_{i_k}^\lambda \check{c}_{i_k}^\lambda, \quad i = l_1 + l_2 + 1, \dots, l_1 + l_2 + l_3,$$

for some $\alpha_{i_j}^\lambda, \beta_{i_k}^\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\check{b}_{i_j}^\lambda, \check{c}_{i_k}^\lambda \in \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_{1,\lambda}) \oplus \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_{2,\lambda})$, depending continuously on λ . We also define

$$w(\tilde{d}_i^\lambda) = \sum_{j,k} \alpha_{i_j}^\lambda w(\check{b}_{i_j}^\lambda) + \beta_{i_k}^\lambda w(\check{c}_{i_k}^\lambda), \quad i = l_1 + l_2 + 1, \dots, l_1 + l_2 + l_3.$$

Then the statements in Lemma 9.1 follows from the fact that we assumed that it holds for Γ_1 and Γ_2 , together with (9.8) and (9.7), and that (v.1) in Lemma 9.2 also holds for these trees.

We also note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{cap}_c(\Gamma) \oplus \text{cap}_v(\Gamma) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma) \\ &= (\text{cap}_c(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{cap}_c(\Gamma_2) \oplus \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{cap}_v(\Gamma_2)) \oplus (\text{cap}_k(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_2)) \\ &= \text{cap}(\Gamma_1) \oplus \text{cap}(\Gamma_2) = \text{cap}(\Gamma), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the statement (k.3) in Lemma 9.3. Hence the induction step for the lemmas 9.1 – 9.3 is proven in the case of gluing at a Y_0 -vertex, on the pre-stabilized level.

To prove Lemma 9.4, it remains to find $\check{d}_j$ associated to the new conformal variation we get when completing the stabilization of the problem. This we do in a similar way as in Step 2.

- (ng) – *gluing at a 2-valent negative puncture*: In the case of 2-valent trees the constructions is similar. Notice that everything simplifies.
- (sgn) and (sgp) – *gluing at switches*: Let $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \# \Gamma_2$ where Γ_1 is an elementary tree containing the switch, and Γ_2 is a tree with k true punctures, satisfying the induction hypothesis. Then again we get

$$\mathbb{R}^n = \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{\Gamma_i} \oplus \text{VirKer}(\Gamma_i) \oplus \text{cap}_k(\Gamma_i), \quad i = 1, 2,$$

noting that $\text{VirKer}(\Gamma_2) = \emptyset$. The same arguments as in the proof of the Y_0 -case apply, with the similar modifications as the ones concerning switches in Step 2.

- (y1g) – *gluing at Y_1 -vertices*: This is also similar to the case of Y_0 -vertices. The difference now is that we have the cusp-stabilization vector v_v^λ associated to the Y_1 -vertex that we are gluing at. In the pre-stabilized case, this vector will belong to $\text{cap}_k(\Gamma)$, and is then moved to $\text{cap}_v(\Gamma)$ under the stabilization process, similar to what is happening in Step 2.

- (f1) and (f2) – *the final gluing*: This is completely similar to the cases above, noting that the statements in Lemma 9.2 are empty.

□

APPENDIX A. FAMILIES OF FREDHOLM OPERATORS RELATED TO TREES

Here we discuss some results about families of Fredholm operators associated to Morse flow trees.

Recall that the pair $(A, \mathbf{w}_\mu)$ of a trivialized Lagrangian boundary condition A and a weight $\mathbf{w}_\mu$ defined on a standard domain Δ is called admissible if the associated $\bar{\partial}$ -operator $\bar{\partial}_A : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[A] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0]$ is Fredholm.

Definition A.1. Let $\Delta = \Delta_m$ be a standard domain and let $\mathbf{w}_\lambda$ be a continuous family of weights defined on Δ . Then a family $A_\lambda : \partial\Delta \rightarrow U(n)$, $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, of boundary conditions is C^2 -admissible if

- (1) $(A_\lambda, \mathbf{w}_\lambda)$ is admissible for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$,
- (2) $A_\lambda : \partial\Delta \rightarrow U(n)$ is smooth and depends continuously on $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, with $\|A_\lambda\|_{C^2}$ bounded for each λ ,
- (3) $\bar{\partial}A_\lambda|_{\partial\Delta} = 0$.

Here the C^k -norm of a matrix $A : X \rightarrow GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ is defined by

$$\|A\|_{C^k} = \sum_{|\alpha_j| \leq k} \sup_{x \in X} \|D^{\alpha_j} A(x)\|_{\max}$$

where the derivative is taken component-wise and $\|A\|_{\max} = \max |a_{ij}|$.

Lemma A.2. Let Γ be a rigid flow tree, an elementary tree or a sub flow tree. Let $\mathbf{w}_\lambda$ be the weight associated to Γ as in Section 6.1. Then there is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that if $\lambda \leq \lambda_0$, then the family of trivialized boundary conditions associated to the pre-glued disk w_λ of Γ , also this described in Section 6.1, is C^2 -admissible.

Proof. This follows by the constructions in [Ekh07], for all λ so small so that $\theta_\lambda < \delta$. $\square$

The following proposition shows that under certain circumstances, the kernels of the operators $\bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda}$ constitute a vector bundle, with topology induced by $[0, 1] \times \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}(\Delta, \mathbb{C}^n)$.

Proposition A.3. Assume that we are given a weight $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_\mu$ and a C^2 -admissible family A_λ , $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, of boundary conditions on Δ_m for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Assume that $\bar{\partial}_{A_0}$ is surjective, and let $(v_1, \dots, v_k)$ be a basis for $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A_0}$. Then there is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ such that for every $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0]$ there is a basis $(v_1^\lambda, \dots, v_k^\lambda)$ for $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda}$ satisfying

$$\|v_i^\lambda - v_i\|_{2,\mu} \leq C \|A_\lambda - A_0\|_{C^2}$$

where $C = C(\{A_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in [0,1]})$.

First we recall the following standard result.

Lemma A.4. Let X be a manifold, and let $\mathbf{w}_\mu$ be a weight function defined on X . If $A : X \rightarrow GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ and $v : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ then

$$\|Av\|_{1,\mu} \leq 2n \|A\|_{C^1} \|v\|_{1,\mu}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{1,\mu}$ denotes the norm on $\mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}(X, \mathbb{C}^n)$ associated to the weight $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_\mu$.

Proof. For $B \in GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ let $\|B\|_{\text{op}}$ denote the operator norm of B , viewed as a linear operator, i.e.

$$\|B\|_{\text{op}} = \sup_{\|z\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}=1} \|Bz\|_{\mathbb{C}^n}.$$

Then we have the following inequality

$$\|B\|_{\max} \leq \|B\|_{\text{op}} \leq n\|B\|_{\max}$$

and hence

$$\langle Av, Av \rangle(x) \leq \|A(x)\|_{\text{op}}^2 \langle v, v \rangle(x) \leq n^2 \|A(x)\|_{\max}^2 \langle v, v \rangle(x)$$

pointwise.

This implies that

$$\|Av\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_X \langle Av\mathbf{w}, Av\mathbf{w} \rangle dm \leq n^2 \|A\|_{C^0}^2 \int_X \langle v\mathbf{w}, v\mathbf{w} \rangle dm = n^2 \|A\|_{C^0}^2 \|v\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2}^2,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|D(Av\mathbf{w})\|_{L^2} &= \|D(A)v\mathbf{w} + AD(v\mathbf{w})\|_{L^2} \leq \|D(A)v\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2} + \|AD(v\mathbf{w})\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq n\|DA\|_{C^0} \|v\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2} + n\|A\|_{C^0} \|D(v\mathbf{w})\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \|Av\|_{1,\mu}^2 &= \|Av\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D(Av\mathbf{w})\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\leq n^2 \|A\|_{C^0}^2 (\|v\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2}^2 + \|D(v\mathbf{w})\|_{L^2}^2) + n^2 \|DA\|_{C^0}^2 \|v\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ &\quad + n^2 \|DA\|_{C^0} \|A\|_{C^0} \|v\mathbf{w}\|_{L^2} \|D(v\mathbf{w})\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq 4n^2 \|A\|_{C^1}^2 \|v\|_{1,\mu}^2. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition A.3. By assumptions the operator $\bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda} : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[A_\lambda] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0]$ is Fredholm for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$. Now, for each $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[A_0] & \xrightarrow{A_\lambda A_0^{-1}} & \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[A_\lambda] \\ \downarrow \bar{\partial}_{A_0} & & \downarrow \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda} \\ \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0] & \xrightarrow{A_\lambda A_0^{-1}} & \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0], \end{array}$$

where the multiplication by $A_\lambda A_0^{-1}$ induce isomorphisms. From this we get an operator

$$\check{A}_\lambda := \bar{\partial} + A_0 A_\lambda^{-1} \bar{\partial} (A_\lambda A_0^{-1}) : \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[A_0] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{1,\mu}[0]$$

which is conjugate to $\bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda}$. Thus $\check{A}_\lambda$ gives a family of Fredholm operators, and we have the following estimate.

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\check{A}_{\lambda_1} - \check{A}_{\lambda_2})v\|_{1,\mu} &= \|A_0(A_{\lambda_2}^{-1} \bar{\partial}(A_{\lambda_1} A_0^{-1}) - A_{\lambda_1}^{-1} \bar{\partial}(A_{\lambda_2} A_0^{-1}))v\|_{1,\mu} \\ &\leq C \|A_{\lambda_1} - A_{\lambda_2}\|_{C^2} \|v\|_{1,\mu} \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $\lambda_1 \rightarrow \lambda_2$. Here C depends on $\|A_\lambda\|_{C^2}$ which by assumptions is uniformly bounded over λ .

Since the operator $\check{A}_0$ is assumed to be surjective it follows from standard arguments in Fredholm theory that there is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that the operator $\check{A}_\lambda$ also is surjective for

$\lambda \leq \lambda_0$, and that the kernels of these operators constitute a vector bundle over $[0, \lambda_0]$. Moreover, a trivialization of this vector bundle is given by the map

$$(\text{id} + T(\check{A}_0 - \check{A}_\lambda)) : \text{Ker } \check{A}_\lambda \rightarrow \text{Ker } \check{A}_0$$

where T is a bounded right inverse for $\check{A}_0$. It follows that if $(v_1, \dots, v_k)$ is a basis for $\text{Ker } \check{A}_0$ then $(\tilde{v}_1^\lambda, \dots, \tilde{v}_k^\lambda)$ gives a basis for $\text{Ker } \check{A}_\lambda$, where

$$\tilde{v}_\lambda^i = (\text{id} + T(\check{A}_0 - \check{A}_\lambda))^{-1} v_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

Moreover,

$$\|\tilde{v}_\lambda^i - v_i\|_{2,\mu} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \|(T(\check{A}_0 - \check{A}_\lambda))^i v_i\|_{2,\mu} = \tilde{C} \cdot \mathcal{O}(\|(A_0 - A_\lambda)\|_{C^2}) \|v_i\|_{2,\mu}$$

where $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(T)$. Now if we multiply v_λ^i by $A_\lambda A_0^{-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, we get a basis for $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda}$ for $\lambda \leq \lambda_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \|A_\lambda A_0^{-1} \tilde{v}_\lambda^i - v_i\|_{2,\mu} &\leq \|(A_\lambda - A_0) A_0^{-1} v_\lambda^i\|_{2,\mu} + \|v_\lambda^i - v_i\|_{2,\mu} \\ &\leq C_1 \|(A_0 - A_\lambda)\|_{C^2} \|v_i\|_{2,\mu} + \tilde{C} \|(A_0 - A_\lambda)\|_{C^2} \|v_i\|_{2,\mu} \end{aligned}$$

□

We summarize the implications of Proposition A.3 by giving some results which are used in Section 8.

Lemma A.5. *Suppose that A_λ , $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, is a C^2 -admissible family of trivialized boundary conditions on D_0 so that $A_0 = \text{id}$. Then there is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that for all $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ we have that $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda}$ is trivial, and there are functions $v_{i,\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}_2[A_\lambda]$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, satisfying*

$$\|v_{i,\lambda} - \partial_{x_i}\|_2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow 0$$

and so that

$$\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda} = \text{Span}(v_{1,\lambda}, \dots, v_{n,\lambda}).$$

Proof. In the limit $\lambda = 0$ the problem is surjective with n -dimensional kernel spanned by $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_n})$. Since surjectivity is an open condition and the problem is Fredholm for all λ the result then follows from Proposition A.3. □

Corollary A.6. *The canonical orientation of $\det \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda}$ is given by the ordered tuple $(v_{1,\lambda}, \dots, v_{n,\lambda})$.*

Corollary A.7. *We have an oriented vector bundle $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A \simeq [0, \lambda_0] \times \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A_0}$ where the trivializations are given by $v_{i,\lambda} \mapsto \partial_{x_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Moreover, the orientation of each fiber is given by the canonical orientation.*

We have a similar result for C^2 -admissible families defined on Δ_i , $i = 1$ or $i = 2$. Indeed, assume that A_λ , $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ is a family of trivialized boundary conditions on Δ_i

with $A_0 = \text{id}$. Assume that $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{w}_\mu$ is a weight function so that $(A_\lambda, \mathbf{w})$ is admissible for all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, and so that the weight vectors satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{If } i = 1 : \quad & \mu_0 = (\underbrace{-\delta, \dots, -\delta}_k, \underbrace{\delta, \dots, \delta}_{n-k}) \\ \text{If } i = 2 : \quad & \mu_0 = (\underbrace{-\delta, \dots, -\delta}_k, \underbrace{\delta, \dots, \delta}_{n-k}), \quad \mu_1 = (-\delta, \dots, -\delta), \text{ or} \\ & \mu_0 = (-\delta, \dots, -\delta), \quad \mu_1 = (\underbrace{-\delta, \dots, -\delta}_k, \underbrace{\delta, \dots, \delta}_{n-k}). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have the following.

Lemma A.8. *There is a $\lambda_0 > 0$ so that for $0 \leq \lambda \leq \lambda_0$ we have that $\text{Coker } \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda}$ is trivial, and there are functions $v_{i,\lambda} \in \mathcal{H}_{2,\mu}[A_\lambda]$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, satisfying*

$$\|v_{i,\lambda} - \partial_{x_i}\|_{2,\mu} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow 0$$

and so that

$$\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A_\lambda} = \text{Span}(v_{1,\lambda}, \dots, v_{k,\lambda}).$$

Proof. From [EES05a] it follows that in the limit $\lambda = 0$ the problem is surjective with k -dimensional kernel spanned by $(\partial_{x_1}, \dots, \partial_{x_k})$. Since surjectivity is an open condition and the problem is Fredholm for all λ the result then follows from Proposition A.3. $\square$

Corollary A.9. *We have an oriented vector bundle $\text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_A \simeq [0, \lambda_0] \times \text{Ker } \bar{\partial}_{A_0}$ where the trivializations are given by $v_{i,\lambda} \mapsto \partial_{x_i}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. This paper is part of the authors Ph.D. thesis at Uppsala University, supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation. The author would like to thank her supervisor Tobias Ekholm for useful discussions, and Michael Sullivan for taking interest in the work and coming with suggestions of improvements.

REFERENCES

- [Che02] Yuri Chekanov. Differential algebra of Legendrian links. *Invent. Math.*, 150(3):441–483, 2002.
- [EENS13] Tobias Ekholm, John B. Etnyre, Lenhard Ng, and Michael G. Sullivan. Knot contact homology. *Geom. Topol.*, 17(2):975–1112, 2013.
- [EES05a] Tobias Ekholm, John Etnyre, and Michael Sullivan. The contact homology of Legendrian submanifolds in $\mathbb{R}^{2n+1}$. *J. Differential Geom.*, 71(2):177–305, 2005.
- [EES05b] Tobias Ekholm, John Etnyre, and Michael Sullivan. Orientations in Legendrian contact homology and exact Lagrangian immersions. *Internat. J. Math.*, 16(5):453–532, 2005.
- [EES07] Tobias Ekholm, John Etnyre, and Michael Sullivan. Legendrian contact homology in $P \times \mathbb{R}$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 359(7):3301–3335 (electronic), 2007.
- [EGH00] Y. Eliashberg, A. Givental, and H. Hofer. Introduction to symplectic field theory. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, (Special Volume, Part II):560–673, 2000. GAFA 2000 (Tel Aviv, 1999).
- [Ek07] Tobias Ekholm. Morse flow trees and Legendrian contact homology in 1-jet spaces. *Geom. Topol.*, 11:1083–1224, 2007.
- [FH93] A. Floer and H. Hofer. Coherent orientations for periodic orbit problems in symplectic geometry. *Math. Z.*, 212(1):13–38, 1993.

- [FO97] Kenji Fukaya and Yong-Geun Oh. Zero-loop open strings in the cotangent bundle and Morse homotopy. *Asian J. Math.*, 1(1):96–180, 1997.
- [FOOO09] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, and Kaoru Ono. *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory: anomaly and obstruction. Part II*, volume 46 of *AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009.
- [HT09] Michael Hutchings and Clifford Henry Taubes. Gluing pseudoholomorphic curves along branched covered cylinders. II. *J. Symplectic Geom.*, 7(1):29–133, 2009.
- [MS12] Dusa McDuff and Dietmar Salamon. *J-holomorphic curves and symplectic topology*, volume 52 of *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 2012.
- [Qui85] D. Quillen. Determinants of Cauchy-Riemann operators on Riemann surfaces. *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.*, 19(1):37–41, 96, 1985.
- [Zin13] Aleksey Zinger. The determinant line bundle for fredholm operators: Construction, properties, and classification. *arxiv.org*, arXiv:1304.6368v1 [math.DG], 2013, 1304.6368.